

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Case No. 08-13555

- - - - -x

In the Matter of:

LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS, INC., et al.

Debtors.

- - - - -x

United States Bankruptcy Court

One Bowling Green

New York, New York

September 19, 2008

4:36 PM

B E F O R E:

HON. JAMES M. PECK

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

HEARING re Debtor's Motion for an Order Pursuant to Section 105
of the Bankruptcy Code Confirming Status of Citibank Clearing
Advances

HEARING re Debtor's Motion to (a) Schedule a Sale Hearing; (b)
Establish Sales Procedures; (c) Approve a Breakup Fee; and (d)
Approve the Sale of the Purchased Assets and the Assumption and
Assignment of Contracts Relating to the Purchased Assets

Transcribed by: Lisa Bar-Leib

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S :

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

Attorneys for Debtor

767 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10153

BY: HARVEY R. MILLER, ESQ.

RICHARD P. KRASNOW, ESQ.

SHAI WAISMAN, ESQ.

LORI R. FIFE, ESQ.

MICHELE J. MEISES, ESQ.

GARRETT A. FAIL, ESQ.

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

Attorneys for Debtor

1395 Brickell Avenue

Suite 1200

Miami, FL 33131

BY: NELLIE P. CAMERIK, ESQ.

(TELEPHONICALLY)

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP

Proposed counsel to the Official Committee of Unsecured
Creditors

One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005

BY: LUC A. DESPINS, ESQ.

DENNIS C. O'DONNELL, JR.

DENNIS F. DUNNE, ESQ.

PAUL ARONSON, ESQ.

EVAN R. FLECK, ESQ.

WILBUR F. FOSTER, ESQ.

CLEARY GOTTLLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

Attorneys for Barclays Capital Inc.

One Liberty Plaza
New York, NY 10006

BY: LISA M. SCHWEITZER, ESQ.

LINDSEE P. GRANFIELD, ESQ

1
2 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

3 Office of the United States Trustee

4 33 Whitehall Street

5 Suite 2100

6 New York, NY 10004

7
8 BY: LINDA A. RIFFKIN, ESQ.

9 ANDREW D. VELEZ-RIVERA, ESQ.

10 TRACY HOPE DAVIS, ESQ.

11 DIANA G. ADAMS, TRUSTEE

12
13 DEWEY & LEBOEUF, LLP

14 Attorneys for CAPCO Holdings Inc. and Customer Asset
15 Protection Company

16 125 West 55th Street

17 New York, NY 10019

18
19 BY: ELIZABETH P. SMITH, ESQ.

20 SAMUEL S. KOHN, ESQ.

21
22
23
24
25
VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

1
2 DEWEY & LEBOEUF, LLP

3 Attorneys for The Royal Bank of Scotland PLC; ABN AMRO
4 NV; and The Walt Disney Company
5 1301 Avenue of the Americas
6 New York, NY 10019
7

8 BY: MARTIN J. BIENENSTOCK, ESQ.

9 IRENA GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.

10 TIMOTHY Q. KARCHER, ESQ.

11 WILLIAM C. HEUER, ESQ.
12

13 MAYER BROWN LLP

14 Attorneys for SP4 190 S. LaSalle, L.P.
15 1675 Broadway
16 New York, NY 10019
17

18 BY: BRIAN TRUST, ESQ.

19 ANTONIA GOLIANOPOULOS, ESQ.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MAYER BROWN LLP

Attorneys for SP4 190 S. LaSalle, L.P.
71 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

BY: THOMAS S. KIRIAKOS, ESQ.
MELISSA A. MICKEY, ESQ.

DESHAW & CO.

39th Floor
Tower 45
120 West Forty-Fifth Street
New York, NY 10036

BY: JO ERN CHEN, ESQ.

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

Attorneys for the Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders
590 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

BY: DANIEL H. GOLDEN, ESQ.
ABID QURESHI, ESQ.

1
2 NIXON PEABODY LLP

3 Attorneys for Intuition Publishing Inc.

4 437 Madison Avenue

5 New York, NY 10022

6
7 BY: ROBERT N.H. CHRISTMAS, ESQ.

8
9 UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

10 3 World Financial Center

11 New York, NY 10279

12
13 BY: ALISTAIRE BAMBACH, ESQ.

14 DAN GALLAGHER, ESQ.

15 NEAL JACOBSON, ESQ.

16
17 POLSINELLI SHALTON FLANIGAN SUELTHAUS PC

18 Attorneys for BATS Holdings, Inc.

19 7 Penn Plaza

20 Suite 600

21 New York, NY 10001

22
23 BY: DANIEL J. FLANIGAN, ESQ.

24 JAMES E. BIRD, ESQ.

25
VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

1
2 ELROD, PLLC

3 Attorneys for TransCanada PipeLines Limited & Affiliates

4 500 North Akard Street

5 Suite 3000

6 Dallas, TX 75201

7
8 BY: DAVID W. ELROD, ESQ.

9
10 GIBBONS P.C.

11 Attorneys for

12 One Gateway Center

13 Newark, NJ 07102

14
15 BY: DAVID N. CRAPO, ESQ.

16
17 KAYE SCHOLER LLP

18 Attorneys for Wells Fargo

19 425 Park Avenue

20 New York, NY 10022

21
22 BY: SCOTT D. TALMADGE, ESQ.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MICHAEL N. DAVID, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Attorney for M&M Technology; M&M Sentinel

82 Wall Street

New York, NY 10005

BY: MICHAEL N. DAVID, ESQ.

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP

Attorneys for Rock-Forty-Ninth LLC; Rockefeller Center

Management Corp.; Rockefeller Group Development Corp.;

Rockefeller Center North, Inc.

919 Third Avenue

New York, NY 10022

BY: MAUREEN CRONIN, ESQ.

MY CHI TO, ESQ.

SATTERLEE STEPHENS BURKE & BURKE LLP

Attorneys for Moody's Investors Service; International

Business Machines Corp.

230 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10169

BY: ABIGAIL SNOW, ESQ.

1
2 LAW OFFICES OF DAVID C. MCGRAIL

3 Attorney for Iron Mountain Information Management, Inc.

4 676 A. Ninth Avenue

5 Suite 211

6 New York, NY 10036

7
8 BY: DAVID C. MCGRAIL, ESQ.

9
10 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

11 Attorneys for

12 787 Seventh Avenue

13 New York, NY 10019

14
15 BY: ALEX R. ROVIRA, ESQ.

16
17 MORGENSTERN & BLUE, LLC

18 Attorneys for Options Clearing Corporation

19 885 Third Avenue

20 New York, NY 10022

21
22 BY: GREGORY A. BLUE, ESQ.

1
2 ARENT FOX LLP

3 Attorneys for The Vanguard Group

4 1675 Broadway

5 New York, NY 10019

6
7 BY: ROBERT M. HIRSH, ESQ.

8
9 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.

10 Attorneys for AT&T Inc.

11 666 Fifth Avenue

12 New York, NY 10103

13
14 BY: DAVID A. ROSENZWEIG, ESQ.

15 MARK C. HAUT, ESQ.

16
17 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.

18 Attorneys for AT&T Inc.

19
20 BY: ANDY BLACK, ESQ.

1
2 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

3 Attorneys for Lehman Brothers Private Equity Funds

4 200 Park Avenue

5 New York, NY 10016

6
7 BY: MICHAEL A. ROSENTHAL, ESQ.

8 JANET M. WEISS, ESQ.

9
10 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

11 Attorneys for Lehman Brothers Private Equity Funds

12
13 BY: OSCAR GARZA, ESQ.

14 (TELEPHONICALLY)

15
16 WILKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

17 Attorneys for IntraLinks, Inc.; Bloomberg L.P.;

18 Bloomberg Finance L.P.; AIG Global Investment; AIG

19 Financial Products

20 787 Seventh Avenue

21 New York, NY 10019

22
23 BY: THOMAS H. GOLDEN, ESQ.

24 SHAUNNA D. JONES, ESQ.

1
2 ARNALL GOLDEN GREGORY LLP

3 Attorneys for the Wholly Owned Subsidiaries of

4 Verizon Communications

5 171 17th Street, N.W.

6 Suite 2100

7 Atlanta, GA 30363

8
9 BY: DARRYL S. LADDIN, ESQ.

10
11 LOWEY DANNENBERG COHEN & HART, P.C.

12 Attorneys for Unofficial Committee of Participants in

13 Deferred Compensation Plan

14 One North Broadway

15 White Plains, NY 10601

16
17 BY: ANNE PENACHIO, ESQ.

18
19 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

20 Attorneys for DTCC

21 1585 Broadway

22 New York, NY 10036

23
24 BY: ADAM T. BERKOWITZ, ESQ.

25 SHELDON I. HIRSHON, ESQ.

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

1
2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP

3 Conflicts Counsel for Committee

4 51 Madison Avenue

5 22nd Floor

6 New York, NY 10010

7
8 BY: SUSHEEL KIRPALANI, ESQ.

9
10 KLEINBERG, KAPLAN, WOLFF & COHEN, P.C.

11 Attorneys for Elliott Associates, L.P., Elliott

12 International, L.P. and the Liverpool Limited

13 Partnership

14 551 Fifth Avenue

15 18th Floor

16 New York, NY 10176

17
18 BY: MATTHEW J. GOLD, ESQ.

MEYER, SUOZZI, ENGLISH & KLEIN, P.C.

Attorneys for SunGard Creditors; Constellation Place

990 Stewart Avenue

Suite 300

Garden City, NY 11530

BY: ALAN MARDER, ESQ.

JIL MAZER-MARINO, ESQ.

ALLEN MATAKINS LECK GAMBLE & MALLORY LLP

Attorneys for SunGard Creditors; Constellation Place, LLC

1900 Main Street

Fifth Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

BY: MICHAEL S. GREGOR, ESQ.

JAMES A. TIMKO, ESQ.

1
2 DIAMOND MCCARTHY LLP

3 Attorneys for DCI Umbrella Fund PLC, Diversified Credit

4 Investments LLC

5 620 Eighth Avenue

6 39th Floor

7 New York, NY 10018

8
9 BY: HOWARD D. RESSLER, ESQ.

10 MARIA M. PATTERSON, ESQ.

11
12 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

13 Attorneys for Wilmington Trust Company as Indenture

14 Trustee

15 The New York Times Building

16 620 Eight Avenue

17 New York, NY 10016

18
19 BY: SUSAN P. JOHNSTON, ESQ.

1
2 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP

3 Attorneys for

4 Four Times Square

5 New York, NY 10036

6
7 BY: DENISE KALOUDIS, ESQ.

8
9 WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ

10 Attorneys for JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

11 51 West 52nd Street

12 New York, NY 10019

13
14 BY: HAROLD S. NOVIKOFF, ESQ.

15 PHILIP MINDLIN, ESQ.

16
17 SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP

18 Attorneys for Bank of America Securities

19 599 Lexington Avenue

20 New York, NY 10022

21
22 BY: JAMES L. GARRITY, ESQ.

1
2 HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

3 Attorneys for Lehman Executives

4 195 Broadway

5 New York, NY 10007

6
7 BY: SANDRA E. MAYERSON, ESQ.

8
9 FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK

10 Assistant General Counsel and Senior Vice President

11 33 Liberty Street

12 New York, NY 10045

13
14 BY: SHARI LEVENTHAL, ESQ.

15
16 LINKLATERS LLP

17 Attorneys for Joint Administrators of Lehman Brothers

18 International Europe

19 1345 Avenue of the Americas

20 New York, NY 10105

21
22 BY: LAWRENCE BYRNE, ESQ.

23 MARTIN N. FLICS, ESQ.

1
2 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON, LLP

3 Attorneys for Bank of New York Mellon

4 30 Rockefeller Plaza

5 24th Floor

6 New York, NY 10112

7
8 BY: CAREN SHULMAN, ESQ.

9 RUSSELL REID, ESQ.

10
11 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON, LLP

12 Attorneys for Bank of New York Mellon

13 333 South Hope Street

14 Los Angeles, CA 90071

15
16 BY: KYLE MATHEWS, ESQ.

17
18 K & L GATES LLP

19 Attorneys for Structure Tone Inc.

20 599 Lexington Avenue

21 New York, NY 10022

22
23 BY: JEFFREY N. RICH, ESQ.

24 KRISTIN S. ELLIOT, ESQ.

25
VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

1
2 SALANS

3 Attorneys for Svenska Handelsbanken AB (publ)
4 Rockefeller Center
5 620 Fifth Avenue
6 New York, NY 10020
7

8 BY: CLAUDE D. MONTGOMERY, ESQ.
9

10 REED SMITH LLP

11 Attorneys for Galleon Buccaneer's Offshore, Ltd.
12 599 Lexington Avenue
13 New York, NY 10022
14

15 BY: LUMA S. AL-SHIBIB, ESQ.
16

17 CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT LLP

18 Attorneys for Citigroup, N.A., Citigroup Inc.,
19 FXCM Holdings, LLC and Morgan Stanley
20 One World Financial Center
21 New York, NY 10261
22

23 BY: DERYCK A. PALMER, ESQ.

24 HOWARD R. HAWKINS, ESQ.

25 ELLEN M. HALSTEAD, ESQ.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MCGUIREWOODS LLP

Attorneys for Meridian Comp of New York d/b/a CHD
Meridian Healthcare; Toronto-Dominion Bank
1345 Avenue of the Americas
Seventh Floor
New York, NY 10105

BY: SHAWN R. FOX, ESQ.

MCGUIREWOODS LLP

Attorneys for Meridian Comp of New York d/b/a CHD
Meridian Healthcare; Toronto-Dominion Bank
One James Center
901 East Cary Street
Richmond, VA 23219

BY: DION W. HAYES, ESQ.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MCGUIREWOODS LLP

Attorneys for Meridian Comp of New York d/b/a CHD

Meridian Healthcare; Toronto-Dominion Bank

625 Liberty Avenue

23rd Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

BY: MICHAEL J. ROESCHENTHALER, ESQ.

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

Attorneys for Amber Capital Investment Management

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, NY 10012

BY: HOWARD SEIFE, ESQ.

DAVID M. LEMAY, ESQ.

ANDREW ROSENBLATT, ESQ.

1
2 CROWELL MORING

3 Attorneys for ICAP North America, Inc. and Affiliates

4 153 East 53rd Street

5 31st Floor

6 New York, NY 10022

7
8 BY: MICHAEL V. BLUMENTHAL, ESQ.

9
10 HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP

11 Attorneys for James Giddens, SIDC Trustee

12 One Battery Park Plaza

13 New York, NY 10004

14
15 BY: JAMES B. KOBAK, JR.

16
17 CURTIS, MALLET-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP

18 Attorneys for NYSE Euronext

19 101 Park Avenue

20 New York, NY 10178

21
22 BY: JERROLD L. BREGMAN, ESQ.

1
2 LOWENSTEIN SANDLER P.C.

3 Attorneys for Avaya Inc.

4 65 Livingston Avenue

5 Roseland, NJ 07068

6
7 BY: PAUL KIZEL, ESQ.

8
9 KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN LLP

10 Attorneys for Bay Harbour Management L.C.; Bay Harbour

11 Master Ltd.; Trophy Hunter Investments, Ltd., BHCO

12 Master, Ltd.; MSS Distressed & Opportunities 2 and

13 Institutional Benchmarks

14 1633 Broadway

15 New York, NY 10019

16
17 BY: DAVID M. FRIEDMAN, ESQ.

18 DAVID S. ROSNER, ESQ.

19 ANDREW K. GLENN, ESQ.

1
2 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

3 Attorneys for Harbinger Capital Partners Special
4 Situations Fund, L.P. and Harbinger Capital Master
5 Fund I, Ltd.

6 399 Park Avenue
7 New York, NY 10022

8
9 BY: JEFFREY S. SABIN, ESQ.

10 RONALD J. SILVERMAN, ESQ.

11 STEVEN WILAMOWSKY, ESQ.
12

13 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

14 Attorneys for Harbinger Capital Partners Special
15 Situations Fund, L.P. and Harbinger Capital Master
16 Fund I, Ltd.

17 150 Federal Street
18 Boston, MA 02110

19
20 BY: SABIN WILLETT, ESQ.
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 STEVENS & LEE, P.C.

3 Attorneys for 1301 Property Owner, LP

4 485 Madison Avenue

5 20th Floor

6 New York, NY 10022
7

8 BY: CHESTER B. SALOMON, ESQ.

9 CONSTANTINE D. POURAKIS, ESQ.
10

11 COMMODITY FUTURE TRADING COMMISSION

12 Office of General Counsel

13 1155 21st Street, N.W.

14 Washington, DC 20581
15

16 BY: BRADFORD M. BERRY, ESQ.

17 ROBERT B. WASSERMAN, ESQ.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 THOMPSON & KNIGHT LLP

3 Attorneys for Chevron Natural Gas and Direct Energy

4 Business, LLC

5 919 Third Avenue

6 39th Floor

7 New York, NY 10022

8
9 BY: IRA L. HERMAN, ESQ.

10 DEMETRA L. LIGGINS, ESQ.

11
12 THOMPSON & KNIGHT LLP

13 Attorneys for Chevron Natural Gas and Direct Energy

14 Business, LLC

15 33 Clay Street

16 Suite 3300

17 Houston, TX 77002

18
19 BY: RHETT G. CAMPBELL, ESQ.

20 MITCHELL E. AYER, ESQ.

1
2 PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP

3 Attorneys for Hilliard Farber & Co., Inc.; Training the
4 Street, Inc.

5 1133 Avenue of the Americas
6 New York, NY 10036
7

8 BY: DAVID W. DYKHOUSE, ESQ.

9 DANIEL A. LOWENTHAL, ESQ.

10 BRIAN P. GUINEY, ESQ.
11

12 MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP

13 Attorneys for Occidental Energy Marketing, Inc.
14 Four Gateway Center
15 100 Mulberry Street
16 Newark, NJ 07101
17

18 BY: EDUARDO J. GLAS, ESQ.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP

3 Attorneys for Occidental Energy Marketing, Inc.

4 Renaissance Centre

5 405 North King Street

6 8th Floor

7 Wilmington, DE 19801

8
9 BY: KATHARINE L. MAYER, ESQ.

10
11 KLESTADT & WINTERS LLP

12 Attorneys for Overstock.com, Inc.

13 292 Madison Avenue

14 17th Floor

15 New York, NY 10017

16
17 BY: TRACE L. KLESTADT, ESQ.

18 JOHN E. JURELLER, JR.

19 SEAN C. SOUTHARD, ESQ.

1
2 BARTLETT HACKETT FEINBERG P.C.

3 Attorneys for Iron Mountain Information Management, Inc.

4 155 Federal Street

5 Boston, MA 02110

6
7 BY: FRANK F. MCGINN, ESQ.

8
9 HALPERIN BATTAGLIA RAICHT, LLP

10 Attorneys for Henegan Construction Co., Inc.

11 555 Madison Avenue

12 9th Floor

13 New York, NY 10022

14
15 BY: WALTER BENZIJA, ESQ.

16 JULIE D. DYAS, ESQ.

17 ALAN D. HALPERIN, ESQ.

1
2 KOBRE & KIM LLP

3 Attorneys for Essex Holdings USA, LLC, 4Kids
4 Entertainment, Northgate Minerals Corporation
5 800 Third Avenue
6 New York, NY 10022
7

8 BY: MICHAEL S. KIM, ESQ.

9 ROBERT W. HENOCH, ESQ.

10 ANDREW C. LOURIE, ESQ.

11 STEVEN W. PERLSTEIN, ESQ.

12 IAN N. LEVY, ESQ.
13

14 GOULSTON & STORRS P.C.

15 Attorneys for 125 High Street, L.P.; Interactive Data
16 Corporation
17 400 Atlantic Avenue
18 Boston, MA 02110
19

20 BY: DOUGLAS B. ROSNER, ESQ.

21 JAMES F. WALLACK, ESQ.

22 GREGORY O. KADEN, ESQ.
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MUNSCH HARDT KOPF & HARR, P.C.

Attorneys for Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders

3800 Lincoln Plaza

500 North Akard Street

Dallas, TX 75201

BY: KEVIN M. LIPPMAN, ESQ.

RAYMOND J. URBANIK, ESQ.

MUNSCH HARDT KOPF & HARR, P.C.

Attorneys for Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders

One American Center

600 Congress Avenue

Suite 2900

Austin, TX 78701

BY: RUSSELL L. MUNSCH, ESQ.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

Attorneys for Fannie Mae

885 Third Avenue

New York, NY 10022

BY: KEITH A. SIMON, ESQ.

MITCHELL SEIDER, ESQ.

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

Attorneys for Fannie Mae

Sears Tower

Suite 5800

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, IL 60606

BY: DAVID S. HELLER, ESQ.

J. DOUGLAS BACON, ESQ.

1
2 BLANK ROME LLP

3 Attorneys for FX Alliance, LLC and its Affiliates and
4 Subsidiaries

5 THE CHRYSLER BUILDING

6 405 Lexington Avenue

7 New York, NY 10174

8
9 BY: MARC E. RICHARDS, ESQ.

10
11 VEDDER PRICE P.C.

12 Attorneys for Pursuit Capital Partners Master (Cayman)

13 Ltd. and Pursuit Opportunity Fund I Master Ltd.

14 1633 Broadway

15 New York, NY 10019

16
17 BY: MICHAEL J. EDELMAN, ESQ.

18 ERIN ZAVALKOFF-BABEJ, ESQ.

1
2 RUSSIN, VECCHI, BERG & BERNSTEIN LLP

3 Attorneys for Dresdner Kleinwort Group Holdings, LLC

4 380 Lexington Avenue

5 Suite 1518

6 New York, NY 10168

7
8 BY: J. FRED BERG, JR., ESQ..

9
10 STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

11 Attorneys for Mizuho Corporate Bank, Ltd.

12 180 Maiden Lane

13 New York, NY 10038

14
15 BY: MARK A. SPEISER, ESQ.

16 SHERRY J. MILLMAN, ESQ.

17
18 SHENWICK & ASSOCIATES

19 Attorneys for Collins Building Services

20 655 Third Avenue

21 20th Floor

22 New York, NY 10017

23
24 BY: JAMES H. SHENWICK, ESQ.

1
2 TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

3 Attorneys for Bank of China, New York Branch

4 The Chrysler Building

5 405 Lexington Avenue

6 New York, NY 10174

7
8 BY: HOLLACE T. COHEN, ESQ.

9 PAUL H. DEUTCH, ESQ.

10
11 LANE POWELL PC

12 Attorneys for Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

13 1420 Fifth Avenue

14 Suite 4100

15 Seattle, WA 98101

16
17 BY: CHARLES R. EKBERG, ESQ.

18
19 LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT E. LUNA, P.C.

20 Attorney for Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School

21 District

22 4411 North Central Expressway

23 Dallas, TX 75205

24
25 BY: ANDREA SHEEHAN, ESQ.

1
2 KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

3 Attorneys for BP Corp North America Inc., BP Energy
4 Company, BP Canada Energy Company, IGI Resources, Inc.
5 101 Park Avenue
6 New York, NY 10178
7

8 BY: JAMES S. CARR, ESQ.
9

10 PLATZER, SWERGOLD, KARLIN, LEVINE, GOLDBERG & JASLOW LLP

11 Attorneys for Hale Avenue Borrower LLC, East 46th
12 Borrower, LLC, 250 East Borrower, LLC
13 1065 Avenue of the Americas
14 18th Floor
15 New York, NY 10018
16

17 BY: SYDNEY G. PLATZER, ESQ.
18

19 LINEBARGER GOGGAN BLAIR & SAMPSON, LLP

20 Attorneys for Dallas County, Tarrant County
21 2323 Bryan Street
22 Suite 1600
23 Dallas, TX 75201
24

25 BY: ELIZABETH WELLER, ESQ.

1
2 CRAVATH SWAINE & MOORE, LLP

3 Attorneys for Credit Suisse

4 Worldwide Plaza

5 825 Eighth Avenue

6 New York, NY 10019

7
8 BY: RICHARD LEVIN, ESQ.

9 ROBERT H. TRUST, ESQ.

10
11 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

12 Attorneys for General Electric Capital Corporation

13 75 East 55th Street

14 New York, NY 10022

15
16 BY: HARVEY A. STRICKEN, ESQ.

17
18 FILARDI LAW OFFICES

19 Attorneys for Federal Express Corporation

20 65 Trumbull Street

21 Second Floor

22 New Haven, CT

23
24 BY: CHARLES J. FILARDI, JR.

1
2 BIALSON, BERGEN & SCHWAB

3 Attorneys for NetApp, Inc. and Network Appliance Limited

4 2600 El Camino Real

5 Suite 300

6 Palo Alto, CA 94306

7
8 HENNIGAN BENNETT & DORMAN

9 865 South Figueroa Street

10 Suite 2900

11 Los Angeles, CA 90017

12
13 BY: JOSHUA D. MORSE, ESQ.

14 (TELEPHONICALLY)

15
16 DUANE MORRIS LLP

17 30 South 17th Street

18 Philadelphia, PA 19103

19
20 BY: MATTHEW E. HOFFMAN, ESQ.

21 (TELEPHONICALLY)

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Do we really have
3 standing room only at that spot? Okay.

4 MR. KRASNOW: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Richard
5 Krasnow from Weil Gotshal & Manges on behalf of the debtors.
6 Your Honor, I believe that there is no one in this crowded
7 courtroom or the overflow courtrooms who has any interest with
8 respect to the motion that is currently before the Court and
9 that I will be addressing. Your Honor will recall that on
10 Wednesday we sought a comfort order with respect to the
11 functions that Morgan Guaranty -- Chase was providing as
12 clearing agent. It provided them with comfort that the
13 collateral that they then had would cover not only the pre-
14 petition advances that they made as clearing agent but also
15 those that occurred during the course of the case. What is
16 before Your Honor this morning (sic) is essentially an
17 identical motion but as to Citibank.

18 THE COURT: You've lost track of time. It's this
19 afternoon.

20 MR. KRASNOW: This afternoon, Your Honor. Yes, I
21 have. Your Honor, as I was saying, essentially the same as
22 that particular motion. The order is essentially the same.
23 The differences only result from the changes in facts: the
24 numbers, the amount of collateral, the level of transactions
25 that take place. The collateral is cash. There is no

1 determination being made in the order with respect to the
2 validity of the guaranties. There is no provision in the order
3 with respect to setoffs. Your Honor, we would rest on the
4 motion and request that the relief be granted.

5 THE COURT: There are no objections that have been
6 filed but this was an emergency motion. The courtroom is
7 packed. This is, for all practical purposes, a clone of the
8 very same relief that was granted the other day in favor of
9 JPMorgan Chase. Let me just verify that there are no
10 objections. Mr. Despins?

11 MR. DESPINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Luc
12 Despins with Milbank Tweed with my partner Dennis Dunne and
13 also Paul Aronson. Could we have -- not to indispose counsel
14 but could we have until the -- just an hour while the other
15 matter is proceeding so that we can confer with counsel just to
16 make sure that everything is not problematic? We don't think
17 there will be a problem, Your Honor, but we just would like a
18 little bit of time to --

19 THE COURT: Well, candidly, the reason that we're
20 doing this now is to dispose of something that was presumed to
21 be noncontroversial.

22 MR. DESPINS: And I think --

23 THE COURT: There's nothing that you've said that
24 tells me that it is controversial. But what I'm going to do is
25 approve it subject to your review of the form of order to

1 satisfy yourself that the relief being granted to Citibank is
2 as represented of like type to the relief that was granted to
3 JPMorgan Chase. Is that fair?

4 MR. DESPINS: That's fine, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Fine. That's what we'll do.

6 MR. KRASNOW: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: You may approach, if that's what you're
8 doing. I can't really tell. Frankly, with so many people in
9 the courtroom, whenever I see the movement this way, I get a
10 little concerned. Mr. Miller?

11 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's sort
12 of difficult to believe, Your Honor, this is the fifth day of
13 this case. In terms of hours, I think we're in the sixth
14 month. In any event, Your Honor, as we described last
15 Wednesday, there are a lot of moving parts to this transaction.
16 And they've been moving with great velocity over the last days
17 since Wednesday. And as a consequence, Your Honor, there has
18 had to be some major changes in the transaction. And
19 unfortunately, they weren't finalized until about a half hour
20 ago. What I would propose, Your Honor, is that if Your Honor
21 will give us a recess for approximately a half hour so we can
22 explain orally to this audience --

23 THE COURT: Excuse me for one moment. Excuse me.

24 MR. MILLER: Going back, Your Honor, a recess for a
25 half hour so that we can orally explain to this audience the

1 nature of those changes and the significance. We think that
2 will expedite the hearing. One other thing, Your Honor, if I
3 might add, a large number of objections, Your Honor, relate to
4 cure amounts on the assumption and assignment of the executory
5 contracts, etcetera. The way it was set up, Your Honor, is
6 that if you did not object to the cure amount today, you were
7 bound by the cure amount. We're making a change in that, Your
8 Honor. All rights to object to the cure amounts and to
9 whatever resolution comes out of that, Your Honor, we are
10 extending to October 3 so that there's no -- if you have a
11 motion or an objection based on the cure amounts, you need not
12 be concerned about it today.

13 THE COURT: Does that mean that if there is a cure
14 objection that hasn't been filed prior to the commencement of
15 today's hearing that there's effectively a broad-based
16 extension for all such parties to file objections --

17 MR. MILLER: That is my impression, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: -- on or before the 3rd of October?

19 MR. MILLER: That's my impression, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: And is there any provision for a hearing
21 in connection with disputes regarding cure amounts?

22 MR. MILLER: Only if the parties don't come to an
23 agreement.

24 THE COURT: Fine.

25 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. So I think that

1 if people have objections based upon that, they should be
2 somewhat relieved.

3 THE COURT: All right. And I'm sure if there are
4 questions during the break, they'll approach you or your
5 partners.

6 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: I think if a half hour is what you think
8 you need --

9 MR. MILLER: Yes.

10 THE COURT: -- why don't we say 5:15 with the
11 understanding that time has proven to be very flexible here in
12 the past this week. And it may turn out that we'll need a
13 little bit more time. But let's make that the holding time and
14 if there's a need for more, somebody should just knock on my
15 chambers door and let me know what's required.

16 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Okay. We're adjourned until 5:15
18 provisionally.

19 (Recess from 4:43 p.m. until 5:41 p.m.)

20 THE COURT: Please be seated. I find myself in the
21 unusual position of being perhaps the only person in the
22 courtroom who doesn't know what everybody else knows because I
23 didn't hear what you told everybody. Do you want to tell me
24 anything?

25 MR. MILLER: Somehow, Your Honor, we knew you were

1 going to ask that question. So --

2 THE COURT: I hate to be that predictable.

3 MR. MILLER: There is a document -- maybe it'd be
4 better, Your Honor, if we do it orally.

5 THE COURT: Fine.

6 MR. MILLER: My partner, Ms. Fife, will do that. And
7 with some assistance from Ms. --

8 THE COURT: Let me just check on something because --
9 and this is purely technical. During the first phase of the
10 hearing, I was told that those people who are listening in
11 spillover courtrooms had a very hard time hearing me. I'm
12 having some difficulty as compared with our last hearing with
13 the amplification coming out of the podium. And I just want to
14 make sure that we're not suffering system overload. Okay.
15 That's on. And let me also make the announcement, whenever
16 anyone speaks for the record, this is always true here, but
17 given the number of people, please identify yourself before
18 speaking.

19 MS. FIFE: Thank you, Your Honor. Lori Fife from
20 Weil Gotshal & Manges on behalf of the debtors. Let me try to
21 summarize the changes that were made to the transaction. In
22 terms of the economic changes, they result largely because of
23 the markets, unfortunately. And from the time that the
24 transaction was actually entered into till now, the markets
25 dropped and the value of the securities dropped as well.

1 So, originally, we were selling assets that had a
2 value of seventy -- approximately seventy billion dollars. And
3 today, Your Honor, we're only selling assets that have a value
4 of 47.4 billion dollars.

5 Barclays is assuming liabilities, however, of 45.5
6 billion dollars in connection with those assets. So that has
7 not changed from the original transaction. There was an upside
8 sharing in the original transaction. There was going to be a
9 true-up twelve months later on and that has been eliminated
10 from this transaction.

11 Barclays is still agreeing to pay the cure amounts on
12 any leases that it assumes or that we assume and assign to it.
13 Barclays is also agreeing to the same employee compensation
14 arrangements. And it is also agreeing to pay the 250 million
15 dollars of goodwill to LBI.

16 With respect to the real estate assets, Your Honor,
17 that was -- we had said at the last hearing, I believe, it was
18 approximately a billion dollars. Since that time, an appraisal
19 has come in and it is below that amount. The contract had a
20 provision which allowed the purchaser really to purchase the
21 building at the appraised amount. So we have some negotiations
22 to go, but I believe that the purchase price will come down by
23 approximately a hundred million dollars.

24 There were two other real estate properties also
25 which we received appraisals for which, similarly, were lower

1 than we had anticipated, unfortunately. So I think,
2 cumulatively, we're expecting that the purchase price will come
3 down by a hundred to maybe 200 million dollars for the real
4 estate.

5 Some other changes that were made to the contracts
6 affect what are called purchase assets and what are excluded
7 assets. There was some confusion as to which subsidiaries, if
8 any, were being sold. And we've clarified in a clarification
9 letter which we're hoping to finalize and actually present to
10 Your Honor whenever it comes down here. But in that letter,
11 we're going to clarify that the only subsidiaries that are
12 being purchased by Barclays are Lehman Brothers Canada Inc.,
13 Lehman Brothers Sudamerica SA and Lehman Brothers Uruguay SA.
14 The latter two subsidiaries that I just referred to relate to a
15 business that is called PIM, or Private Investment Management
16 Business, which is a business that was not part of the original
17 deal but is now being purchased by Barclays.

18 THE COURT: For no additional consideration?

19 MS. FIFE: That's correct, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: And what's that business worth?

21 MS. FIFE: It's essentially just people, Your Honor.
22 It's the high net worth individual brokerage business. And
23 it's really just the people who are in those offices.

24 THE COURT: And their rolodexes.

25 MS. FIFE: And their rolodexes, exactly. The

1 customer accounts were being transferred anyway.

2 There was a change that was made to the license of
3 the Lehman Brothers' name. It was perpetual. It is now two
4 years but we don't really believe that that's a problem. The
5 IMD business, which is essentially Neuberger Berman and some
6 other related entities, will have a perpetual license to use
7 the name.

8 There was a provision in the old agreement pursuant
9 to which the parties were sharing the residential real estate
10 mortgages. There is no longer that provision. Barclays was
11 required to post collateral, actually this morning, in order to
12 get DTC to open up trading. And that collateral was posted --
13 the residential real estate mortgages was posted to DTC.
14 Pursuant to this transaction, Barclays is taking over and
15 guaranteeing all of those transactions. And they are assuming
16 the risk related to those transactions so that collateral will
17 remain with Barclays.

18 THE COURT: What's the aggregate value of the posted
19 collateral?

20 MS. FIFE: One second, Your Honor.

21 (Pause)

22 MS. FIFE: Your Honor, I'm not -- excuse me? There
23 are 300,000 trades but we're not sure the value of the
24 collateral. Perhaps during the rest of the hearing we can find
25 that amount out for Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not entirely sure I'm
2 understanding the overall impact of the change in the sharing
3 of the residential mortgage collateral and whether or not that
4 constitutes a benefit to the estate or a detriment to the
5 estate. Which do you think it is?

6 MS. FIFE: It's hard to tell. It depends on which
7 way those trades come out. But we believe it's a benefit to
8 the estate because it allowed trading to continue this morning
9 because DTC and NASDAQ were unwilling to allow Lehman to
10 continue trading without this posting of collateral which was
11 very important to the company, obviously. So we were able to
12 work out this arrangement whereby Barclays would stand behind
13 the trades. It is the debtors' belief that it's a necessary
14 part of the transaction.

15 THE COURT: Okay. And I realize I'm asking a lot of
16 questions about things that may have been fully explained when
17 I was in chambers, but Barclays' undertaking to stand behind,
18 as you put it, this posted collateral, how is that documented?
19 And what happens in the event that the transaction that we're
20 now talking about is not approved or is delayed?

21 MS. FIFE: It was documented in the First Amendment
22 to the asset purchase agreement, which we actually do have and
23 if the transaction is not consummated -- I'm actually not sure
24 of the answer, Your Honor. I'm sorry. I believe Barclays is
25 liable. Oh, okay. So, I'm advised by my partner that if the

1 transaction's not consummated then the transactions -- all the
2 trades come back to Lehman, and Lehman is then responsible for
3 them. Excuse me for one second, Your Honor.

4 (Pause)

5 MS. FIFE: I'm being told that if the liabilities are
6 less than the collateral then the excess collateral comes back
7 to Lehman.

8 THE COURT: And if the liabilities are greater?

9 MS. FIFE: We have no further obligation.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MS. FIFE: We also modified the agreement -- would
12 you like the representative from DTC to explain that in more
13 detail, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Mr. Hirshon, I'd be happy to hear from
15 you.

16 MR. HIRSHON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Nice to be
17 before you. Sheldon Hirshon, Proskauer Rose, representing the
18 composite -- the trust clearing corporations. Your Honor, the
19 essence of the transaction is to move all of the accounts
20 seamlessly from Lehman to Barclays. What DTC does is the
21 plumbing of that and handles all of the details in the settling
22 of the trades.

23 THE COURT: Is that how they describe themselves?

24 MR. HIRSHON: That's how I describe them because
25 until Sunday, I didn't understand any of this. But it is what

1 spigots get turned on and off and how the pipeline is filled
2 and then emptied. So each day -- there are several different
3 clearinghouses. And each day the trades are matches and then
4 either a net number goes to Lehman or from Lehman to DTC or any
5 of its clearing companies. There was a depository that holds
6 all of the securities. The residential mortgages that you've
7 heard about that were going to be split fifty/fifty are in the
8 DTC registry. We hold them now. They are there. Originally,
9 the idea for the original transaction was to split those
10 fifty/fifty between Barclays and the estate. But in order to
11 facilitate the settlement of these accounts, the additional
12 fifty percent was needed so that DTC would not be at risk for
13 the settlement. So the --

14 THE COURT: So this modification principally is for
15 the benefit of your client?

16 MR. HIRSHON: Correct. And for the transaction,
17 because without it trading would have stopped. There would be
18 no business to sell because there would have been no -- no
19 trades cleared today. So it was to facilitate the transaction
20 as a friend to the transaction that this was done so that the
21 business continues to operate today. Now, the arrangement is
22 that the whole six billion dollars of residential mortgages
23 will be there and subject to settlement. But the anticipation
24 is that once all these claims settle, the trades that are from
25 Wednesday through Monday settle, there will not be a need for

1 all of that collateral. So what the amendment to the APA says
2 is that the fifty percent will be returned, as long as it's
3 there. If something really terrible happens in the world and
4 the settlements don't work and we have to use that collateral,
5 then there will be nothing to return. But the anticipation is
6 that if the world remains somewhat stable that the fifty
7 percent that was now transferred to Barclays will be
8 transferred back to Lehman. That is the expectation.

9 THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that
10 explanation.

11 One comment before you continue, Ms. Fife. I'm just
12 once again hearing the Geiger counter. And we are connected to
13 two extra courtrooms and I know that there are people
14 participating at various occasions by telephone through
15 CourtCall. And I'm hearing increased static on the line. So,
16 I'm just going to request everybody who is participating in
17 this hearing, whether by telephone or in person, who has an
18 electronic device to shut it off. And if you're on the phone,
19 since you're just listening, please mute your phone.

20 MS. FIFE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll continue
21 going through some of the changes, if that's okay. There was a
22 provision in a deal originally which required the debtors to
23 transfer 700 million dollars in cash to Barclays. And that is
24 no longer the case. There's no cash that's being transferred
25 to Barclays.

1 In addition, there was a provision in the contract
2 where Barclays was going to purchase a company called Eagle
3 Energy Management and they are no longer going to purchase that
4 entity.

5 We clarified, because a number of creditors had some
6 concerns during the -- yesterday we had a meeting with the
7 creditors and they were asked some questions regarding
8 intercompany claims. We made it very clear in this
9 clarification that we are not transferring any intercompany
10 payables or receivables. Those remain with the particular
11 entities.

12 There was a reference in the agreement to a mortgage
13 that was on the 745 Seventh Avenue property. And as it turned
14 out, Your Honor, there is no mortgage on that property. So we
15 deleted that reference. There was a 500 million dollar
16 promissory note made by 745 in favor of an affiliate which will
17 be repaid and extinguished.

18 Those are the major changes to the transaction.
19 There were some other clarifications that we made but I don't
20 consider them material, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: I still consider 500 million dollars
22 material, though.

23 MS. FIFE: Yes.

24 THE COURT: So, the money that's due an affiliate,
25 what affiliate is that? And as a result of the payment, how

1 does that impact the overall realization to the estate?

2 MS. FIFE: Umm --

3 THE COURT: Maybe it doesn't.

4 MS. FIFE: Yeah. I don't think it does, Your Honor.
5 We still anticipate that the full purchase price will be paid
6 to 745 and then transferred up to the holding company and the
7 note will be extinguished -- I'm sorry? Yeah. It already has
8 been extinguished.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MS. FIFE: Do you have any further questions, Your
11 Honor?

12 THE COURT: I may have some as we proceed. It's hard
13 for me to tell, based upon this helpful oral presentation, how
14 the deal has moved in terms of material changes and whether or
15 not those changes affect, in any way, the objectors and whether
16 or not these are changes that make the objectors happy or sad.

17 MS. FIFE: Right.

18 THE COURT: It's unclear to me at the moment because
19 I haven't had a chance to reflect on it and I don't know what
20 documents have been prepared that will clarify this. But I'm
21 confident that as the evening progresses, I'll learn more.

22 MS. FIFE: Yes. We're hopeful that we'll have the
23 documents so that everyone can look at them. And just one
24 other thing I wanted to point out to Your Honor, we are keeping
25 approximately twenty million dollars -- twenty billion dollars

1 of assets in LBI that are not being transferred. So those
2 assets will have value and inure to the benefit to the SIPC
3 estate. Okay?

4 THE COURT: Thank you for that.

5 MS. FIFE: I'm now going to turn it over to Mr.
6 Miller.

7 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I don't think it's necessary
8 to repeat that we did make another change in connection with
9 the time to object to cure amounts which was in --

10 THE COURT: I remember you said that before. One
11 thing I do want to take care of as a piece of unfinished
12 business from before the break. And that's the creditors'
13 committee's position with regard to the Citibank comfort order.

14 MR. DESPINS: Your Honor, there was a reason why
15 there was some -- we couldn't address it is 'cause our
16 conflicts counsel was going to look at those issues. Susheel
17 Kirpalani is here and he will address that, Your Honor.

18 MR. KIRPALANI: Good evening, Your Honor. Susheel
19 Kirpalani of Quinn Emanuel for the creditors' committee. Your
20 Honor, it's been represented to us that this is the same type
21 of relief that was requested with respect to the Chase motion.

22 THE COURT: It was represented to me as well.

23 MR. KIRPALANI: Yes, Your Honor. It appears that the
24 language is the same. The Chase motion -- or the Chase order
25 dealt with securities and cash. And so the language is a

1 little bit different. It talks about how the pre-petition
2 amounts are -- or the post-petition amounts are secured by as
3 opposed to have an allowable setoff right. And while I agree
4 that's not a distinction with a difference, the one thing
5 that's not clear to me from the Chase motion is the mutuality
6 issue. I apologize, but the timing is such that I've been
7 getting e-mails from my office. If I could just ask the
8 debtors, was there no mutuality issue in the Chase motion and
9 the same issue here? Meaning that in the Chase motion, was it
10 clear that the accounts and the obligations were both owed by
11 the same entity and the same thing is true here? Or are we
12 relying on a contract exception to mutuality?

13 MR. KRASNOW: Your Honor, both as to the JPMorgan
14 Chase agreements, so too as with respect to the Citibank
15 agreements, Holdings is the guarantor. And it is Holdings'
16 collateral which was at issue in both instances. So, other
17 than JPMorgan Chase dealing with securities and cash, although
18 as to the Holdings company, it was just cash, as I recall, with
19 respect to Citibank, it is just cash. So in all material
20 respects, the orders are identical, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: I'm satisfied. Are you?

22 MR. KIRPALANI: Yes, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Good.

24 MR. KRASNOW: Thank you.

25 MR. KIRPALANI: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: The order will be entered.

2 MR. KRASNOW: Your Honor, may I be excused? I think
3 that was my only --

4 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

5 MR. KRASNOW: I think that was my only business here.
6 Should I be excused?

7 THE COURT: You mean, you don't want to stay? Sure,
8 you may be excused.

9 MR. KRASNOW: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Good evening.

12 MR. MILLER: You know, Your Honor, as I was sitting
13 here listening to what was going on, it occurred to me that the
14 way we do business today is so different from the way we used
15 to do business.

16 THE COURT: It could be you.

17 MR. MILLER: It could be me. I had trouble getting
18 through security today.

19 THE COURT: Do you have anything on in your pocket?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you radioactive?

21 MR. MILLER: I think my flak jacket, Your Honor. I
22 think that's it. These decisions, Your Honor, are being made
23 almost in split second timing. One has to think about the
24 decisions that were made in connection with the bailout at Bear
25 Stearns. How much time was devoted to that? The decision to

1 open access to the Primary Dealer Credit Facility at the
2 Federal Bank to support the banking industry, to commit the
3 federal government to what might be hundreds of billions of
4 dollars to save Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and to have the
5 government advance eighty-five billion dollars to save AIG.
6 And now, Your Honor, within the space of maybe a few days for
7 the government to adopt a variation of the Resolution Trust
8 Company or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to save the
9 economy and the welfare of the people who are dependent upon a
10 stable economy.

11 The tragedy of Lehman, Your Honor, is part and parcel
12 of the design to preserve and stabilize financial markets.
13 Access to federal funding to maintain the business of Lehman
14 Brothers incorporated the need to put Lehman Brothers Holdings
15 Inc. into Chapter 11 as part of a plan to move that sensitive
16 business of LBI to a qualified buyer as soon as possible. A
17 buyer who meets the qualifications necessary to operate such a
18 business -- which is a universe, I might add, Your Honor, that
19 is only limited to a few possible candidates. In making those
20 decisions that the government or parties involved wait for
21 ordered reports, appraisals, physical inventories, a review of
22 each and every document relating to the transaction, I think,
23 Your Honor, the answer is no. They had to do what was
24 necessary to protect the greater good and not to lose the
25 forest for the trees.

1 Clearly, our economy was and is dependent upon those
2 decisions and sole decisions which would come in the future few
3 weeks. The decisions affected and would affect millions of
4 people. In the case of Lehman, it affects directly the 25,000
5 employees whose futures became extremely clouded because of the
6 events of last weekend.

7 The future of many of those people hangs in the
8 balance in connection with the transaction before the Court.
9 If it's not approved, no one can predict with any certainty the
10 consequences other than to note that there will be additional
11 turmoil and thousands of transactions will be suspended. The
12 volatility and distress of the liquidation of collateral
13 positions will be unmatched in history. The unemployment rolls
14 for the metropolitan area will increase dramatically, not to
15 mention the financial losses incurred by ordinary people who
16 would be prejudiced by their inability to reach their accounts.

17 Expedition, Your Honor, is mandatory. Events move
18 with the velocity that almost defies comprehension. In this
19 kind of world, form cannot be exalted over substance. The
20 substance of this transaction is to continue a business for the
21 benefit of the general economy, the employees whose lives are
22 at stake and to fit a small piece into the jigsaw puzzle of
23 maintaining a stable economy. We cannot take the risk of
24 rejecting this transaction because of ambiguities, the lack of
25 a piece of paper to support every element of the assets to be

1 transferred, the lack of definition as to particular items. We
2 have to think and we have to act in the same manner that the
3 decisions were made by the government and others over the past
4 week to expend billions and billions of dollars to shore up the
5 economy. Lehman is here because it was necessary to assure
6 LBI's access to the support of the Federal Reserve Bank and the
7 SEC support and to allow LBI access to the window to support
8 the transactions that were pending before there was a run on
9 the bank. To dissipate that effort, by rejecting a transaction
10 that is intended to save jobs, protect customers and enable a
11 relatively smooth transition of the LBI business and bring
12 value to all involved, would be a miscarriage of justice and
13 detrimental to the national interest.

14 Since the hearing last Wednesday, and in the space of
15 roughly twenty-four hours, Your Honor, there have been a number
16 of significant events. Yesterday, the Chicago Mercantile
17 Exchange unilaterally decided to close out all of Lehman's
18 positions on that exchange. That closeout resulted in a loss
19 to Lehman of approximately 1.6 billion dollars. Earlier this
20 afternoon, Your Honor, the Securities Investor Protection
21 Corporation initiated a proceeding under the Securities
22 Investor Protection Act in the United States District Court for
23 the Southern District of New York.

24 THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Miller. You're being
25 interrupted, as is this entire proceeding, by someone who's on

1 the telephone who's whispering into the courtroom. As I said
2 at the outset, everybody who is listening on the phone, mute
3 your phone. Everybody who has an electronic device, find it
4 and shut it off or throw it away.

5 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, as I was saying, this
6 afternoon the Securities Investor Protection Corporation
7 initiated a proceeding under the Securities Investor Protection
8 Act in the United States District Court for the Southern
9 District of New York. Mr. James Giddens, an attorney and
10 experienced SIPC trustee, has been appointed as trustee in the
11 SIPC proceeding. LBI consented to the commencement of the SIPC
12 proceeding. And during the past few days, Mr. Giddens was
13 provided with information concerning the state of affairs at
14 LBI and the need for expedition and support of the sale
15 transaction. Mr. Giddens is a recognized SIPC trustee and a
16 man of great talent, Your Honor. He recognized the
17 extraordinary nature of what is occurring and, unusual for a
18 SIPC proceeding, SIPC and the trustee have agreed that trading
19 in customer accounts --

20 THE COURT: Sorry. Technical difficulties.

21 MR. MILLER: In that SIPC proceeding, Your Honor, the
22 trustee and SIPC have agreed that trading in customer accounts
23 may continue in the ordinary course of business rather than be
24 suspended as is usual in a SIPC proceeding. SIPC and the
25 trustee have expended extraordinary efforts in an extraordinary

1 case to protect the public customers and ensure stability and
2 preservation of customer interests. Their actions are to be
3 commended, Your Honor. And I believe, Your Honor, that the
4 SIPC proceeding has been referred, I hope, to Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: I've seen Judge Lynch's order. I have a
6 certified copy of it and the order includes a decretal
7 paragraph removing those proceedings to this court. I'm
8 satisfied that the seal is in fact genuine and I'm prepared to
9 proceed with full authority.

10 MR. MILLER: And, Your Honor, Mr. Giddens is here
11 with Mr. Kevin (sic) Caputo from SIPC and the president of
12 SIPC, Your Honor, Mr. Stephen Harbeck who's sitting in the jury
13 box.

14 THE COURT: Gentlemen, welcome.

15 MR. GIDDENS: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 MR. MILLER: Barclays, Your Honor, has extended the
17 sale to enable this extraordinary transaction and hopefully to
18 be consummated. Yesterday, as Your Honor has heard, Barclays
19 basically stepped into the shoes of the Federal Reserve in
20 connection with the Primary Dealer Credit Facility as to the
21 45.5 billion dollars Lehman borrowed last Monday and received
22 the collateral that Lehman had posted in connection therewith.

23 Because of the circumstances this week, Your Honor,
24 the operations of LBI have resulted in approximately 300,000
25 sales, which is very significant. In addition, Your Honor,

1 because of the administration proceeding in the United Kingdom
2 for LBIE and the freezing of all of the assets of LBI that were
3 in the possession of LBIE, which I believe, Your Honor, stands
4 for Lehman Brothers England, relating to repo financings, the
5 result is that we were unable -- or LBI is unable to deliver to
6 Barclays the assets that were originally intended under the
7 APA. That's one of the reasons, Your Honor, for the amendments
8 that we heard about earlier today.

9 There are many moving parts in what we are trying to
10 do, many of which are beyond the control of Lehman or Barclays
11 as market forces operate to affect the value of the transaction
12 and the assets. Enormous problems did arise in connection with
13 clearing transactions that have caused a number of
14 modifications to the transaction. The necessity of assuring
15 DTC and other clearing institutions who will not expose
16 themselves to additional liability of some kind has been
17 enormously time consuming.

18 It's because of that, Your Honor, that we have heard
19 about these changes. But if Your Honor will look at the basic
20 agreement, the amount of cash consideration will be relatively
21 the same except for the issues with respect to the value of the
22 real estate. The 250 million dollars being paid for the
23 goodwill of LBI will go to LBI. The real estate, 745 Seventh
24 Avenue, and the two data centers in New Jersey, that's with a
25 variation, Your Honor, and there's some negotiation to be done

1 with Barclays in connection with that. And so there might be a
2 decrease of that one billion four fifty that we talked about on
3 Wednesday to something in the area of a billion three to a
4 billion three fifty, in that area.

5 THE COURT: Let me break in with respect to that
6 issue --

7 MR. MILLER: Sure.

8 THE COURT: -- because it's something that concerns
9 me. I read most of the objections --

10 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.

11 THE COURT: -- and there were a lot of them. And I
12 may have missed some that came in late. But none of them
13 picked up the issue that concerned me. As I view the
14 transaction, and I need your help in telling me if I'm seeing
15 it incorrectly, most of the value is attributed to the real
16 estate. But there has been no traditional marketing effort for
17 the real estate. Instead, the real estate represents a tie-in
18 to the sale of the broker dealer assets and the preservation of
19 markets and employment. One of the things that I think you may
20 need to get over for purposes of today's evidentiary hearing,
21 in terms of the showing you need to make, is that the
22 transaction as it relates to the real estate in particular is
23 fair value.

24 I know nothing about this appraisal. I don't know
25 who commissioned it. I don't know who the appraiser is. I

1 don't know if he or she is in court. But I am, frankly,
2 concerned that we're all hearing -- and maybe others heard it
3 earlier but I'm hearing it only now -- that there is this
4 negative variance in the assumed value of the real estate. And
5 I find that troublesome.

6 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. We will try to deal with
7 that, Your Honor. Now, Your Honor, in connection with going
8 forward in the transaction, I don't know what order Your Honor
9 wants to go in, whether you want to hear oral statements of
10 objections or should we move right to the evidentiary hearing?

11 THE COURT: Well, one of the things I'd like to do,
12 and it's really to verify something, I don't recall seeing an
13 objection from the official creditors' committee. And I don't
14 know, as a result of that, whether the committee supports the
15 transaction, has issues with respect to the transaction or has
16 given you notice of whatever objections they might have. So it
17 seems to me that because of the expedited nature of today's
18 proceeding, we agreed Wednesday that written objections were
19 not necessary and, particularly, not necessary in the case of
20 the committee which had just been formed. I'd like to know
21 what the status is as it relates to that important
22 constituency.

23 MR. MILLER: Mr. Despins informed me, Your Honor,
24 before the hearing -- I'm losing my voice -- that the committee
25 will not object to the transaction but does not support it. So

1 they're not affirmatively -- I think not affirmatively going to
2 stand up and say --

3 MR. DESPINS: Why don't I address that, Your Honor?

4 MR. MILLER: Sure.

5 THE COURT: I think that would be helpful.

6 MR. MILLER: Don't change your position.

7 MR. DESPINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Luc
8 Despins with Milbank Tweed, proposed counsel for the committee.
9 I'm here with my partners, Paul Aronson and Dennis Dunne. The
10 headline is we are not objecting, Your Honor, but although
11 we'll have some minor comments to the form of order, which we
12 don't need to detain the court order at this point. And the
13 reason we're not objecting is really based on the lack of a
14 viable alternative. And, Your Honor, we're still a little bit
15 puzzled by the statement by Mr. Miller that we're not
16 affirmatively supporting. And that's correct. We're not
17 affirmatively supporting the transaction, Your Honor, because
18 there has been insufficient time for us to really do all the
19 due diligence that we would feel should be done to take that
20 next step of saying yes, this is the best deal and we're
21 supportive actively. We've met with the debtor. They've been
22 very cooperative. I don't want to imply that they have not
23 been but we have not had time to test the assumptions and do
24 all the due diligence we would normally do. So that is, Your
25 Honor, the distinction.

1 The second message, Your Honor, which is not directed
2 at Your Honor but really at the debtor and, generally, at also
3 regulators, is that the committee, although we're not objecting
4 to this transaction, we understand we're dealing with
5 extraordinary circumstances, as Your Honor has described. The
6 committee fully expects that after this, we're going to go back
7 to what I would call --

8 THE COURT: A more conventional model?

9 MR. DESPINS: Yes. Business as usual for Chapter 11,
10 if you will, Your Honor. The committee feels very strongly and
11 wanted me to say that they recognize the extraordinary nature
12 of what's going on here but they feel their duties are to pre-
13 petition creditors, not to the market participants, not to the
14 economy at large or other participants in those markets. And I
15 think that that's very important and it's very important to the
16 committee that I convey that message, again, not to Your Honor,
17 but really to the debtor and other parties in this case. So
18 that is where we stand, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: I appreciate that. And it lifts the fog
20 over at least that aspect of the case. And I'm grateful for
21 the comment. Has there been any --

22 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, we --

23 THE COURT: Has there been any resolution by
24 agreement of any of the other objections? Or are they all live
25 at this point --

1 MR. MILLER: As far as --

2 THE COURT: -- except for the cure amounts perhaps?

3 MR. MILLER: As far as I know, Your Honor, I have to
4 say, Your Honor, there wasn't really time. They were cascading
5 through the electronic filing at such a rate, it was almost
6 impossible to keep up with them.

7 THE COURT: I know.

8 MR. MILLER: And so, with people dedicated to doing
9 the clarification of the APA -- of the asset purchase
10 agreement, there really wasn't an adequate amount of time. As
11 Mr. Despins says, Your Honor, this is such an exceptional
12 circumstance, I would feel relieved to get back to the ordinary
13 Chapter 11 process. It would be good for everybody's health.
14 But this is just an unusual situation. And while I understand
15 the committee's views and the parochial views as to general
16 unsecured creditors, we are facing a bigger picture and a very
17 difficult severe picture for everybody involved. And in
18 addition to the people in this courtroom, Your Honor, the
19 telephone is going -- just I can't tell you the rapidity of
20 calls from people, where's -- how can I get my securities?
21 This is my pension fund. And so on. This is a tragedy, Your
22 Honor. And maybe we missed the RTC by a week. That's the real
23 tragedy, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: That occurred to me as well.

25 MR. MILLER: So I defer to Your Honor as to the

1 procedure for going forward. Should we have -- I would waive
2 opening statements at this point, Your Honor, since I've
3 already made mine.

4 THE COURT: Well, I propose the following. And I
5 think you've made your opening statement. I would propose the
6 following. I would like to hear -- I'm not sure what the right
7 time for that is -- from counsel for the SIPC trustee or the
8 SIPC trustee, beyond the fact that we've commenced a case, and
9 understand a little bit more about how that parallel proceeding
10 that is happening as we speak, in conjunction with the sale
11 process, truly does tie together with what we're now doing.
12 And I think that it would be useful for me to have an
13 evidentiary record that supports the sale motion. Once that
14 record is made, either through proffer or live testimony, based
15 upon the willingness of objectors to do it through proffer --
16 and if they object, that's fine. We can have witnesses. I
17 think it would be useful then to move on to the merits of the
18 objections and deal with the legal issues that confront us.

19 MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Caputo from SIPC
20 is here with us today.

21 THE COURT: Fine. Before he gets up, let me just
22 confirm that what I have -- often what I say is acceptable to
23 people when they hear it. But -- at least when I'm sitting
24 here. But is what I have outlined consistent with your views?

25 MR. MILLER: Whatever you say, Your Honor, is

1 acceptable to me.

2 THE COURT: Fine. I figured you'd say that. Let's
3 hear from the SIPC trustee.

4 MR. CAPUTO: Your Honor, my name is Kenneth Caputo.
5 I am counsel for the Securities Investor Protection Corporation
6 and I will be brief in my remarks and let counsel for the
7 trustee step in.

8 We did commence a case earlier today before Judge
9 Lynch intended to protect public customers of LBI. That has
10 commenced the SIPA liquidation which brings into there all of a
11 different proceeding but for the most part, it is essentially a
12 bankruptcy proceeding, Chapters 1, 3, 5 and subchapters 1 and 2
13 of Chapter 7 all apply in a SIPA case specifically. The unique
14 nature of what we have done in this case -- there are a few,
15 but first I have to mention the collaborative nature of the
16 proceeding that we had with all of the different regulatory
17 agencies. We had tremendous cooperation from the SEC, from the
18 Federal Reserve Bank of New York, from the CFTC, from private
19 parties, if you will, JPMorgan Chase, DTC.

20 I'm apologizing if I leave anybody out. But we came
21 together with a collaborative approach to deal with these
22 exigent circumstances, these truly unique circumstances. And
23 the other thing we've done is permitting the trustee to operate
24 the business of the debtor under 721 of the Code for a limited
25 period of time. That period of time to allow for transactions

1 to be affected expired at 6 p.m. this evening. And that was at
2 the urging of regulatory agencies and DTC to permit many more
3 contracts to be settled and then moved out of the entity so
4 that these individual customers can gain access to their
5 property in a quicker fashion.

6 The trustee also has the ability here to complete
7 settlement of transactions through next Tuesday, which is a 6
8 p.m. date on that regard, and to take other actions as
9 necessary to allow for the orderly transfer of customer
10 accounts. It is SIPC's goal here to get out of the way of the
11 normal and ordinary course of business and the fair and orderly
12 market transactions that can be affected so that not only the
13 institutional but the public customers of LBI have access to
14 their account in as quick a fashion as possible. It is my
15 understanding, based on representations from LBHI and their
16 participants, that we're talking about more than 600,000
17 accounts. Many of them are institutional. I believe the
18 number is somewhere in the range of 130,000 customer accounts
19 non-institutional. There was some allusion today to the PIM
20 aspect of the transaction which was affected and performs a new
21 part of the deal. Your Honor had a question about it. We
22 support it. It allows these customers, these high net worth
23 customers, essentially, to be moved and Barclays is assuming
24 those customers on the same platform at DTC, is my
25 understanding, that existed. So this is also going to permit

1 the effective administration of that estate of the trustee and
2 have less to do, essentially, Monday morning. And we stand
3 back from the proceeding at first but we have committed all of
4 the energy and all of the resources of SIPC to enable the SIPC
5 trustee to get his work done, to enable Barclays to step in,
6 take over the accounts that they are willing to take over and
7 then to deal with the other transactions in the ordinary course
8 of business as necessary.

9 THE COURT: Let me ask you a question about the
10 timing imperative as it relates to the undertakings of your
11 client. You mentioned a 6 p.m. cutoff date, I think, on
12 Tuesday.

13 MR. CAPUTO: Yeah.

14 THE COURT: In order for this transaction to be
15 optimally closed from the perspective of SIPC, when should it
16 close? Does it need to close this weekend before the markets
17 open on Monday?

18 MR. CAPUTO: The sale transaction?

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MR. CAPUTO: As soon as possible it needs to close.
21 The sooner the better. That's going to provide certainty to
22 parties and counterparties so that they can take the actions
23 that they deem necessary to protect their clients but it also
24 provides certainty to the hundreds of thousands of customers.
25 And that provides comfort to the markets and I think comfort on

1 a national scale as Mr. Miller alluded.

2 THE COURT: So without putting any more words in your
3 mouth, would it be your position on behalf of your client that,
4 assuming the sale transaction that has been proposed to me
5 today is approved, that the approval should happen before the
6 close of today's hearing? In other words, we should stay here
7 as late as we need to in order to get this done?

8 MR. CAPUTO: Yes, Your Honor. That would be our
9 recommendation.

10 THE COURT: Fine.

11 MR. CAPUTO: And if I may, Your Honor, I'd defer to
12 Mr. James Kobak, counsel for Hughes Hubbard who is counsel to
13 the trustee, to fill you in on some of the particulars
14 involving the actions that the trustee will take.

15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

16 MR. KOBAK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Actually,
17 Mr. Caputo has done a lot of my job for me. So I would just
18 like to echo everything he said, especially the extraordinary
19 cooperation of everybody involved. Mr. Giddens is here and
20 he's prepared, and I think, in fact, he would probably like to
21 address you and some of the other counsel if you think that's
22 appropriate. I do have a couple of housekeeping items or maybe
23 a little more than housekeeping. This case has now been
24 officially assigned to you. It's on the docket and so forth.
25 We have an administrative order which would do things like

1 change the caption, approve the form of notice and so forth.
2 So we'll be filing that either over the weekend or sometime
3 early next week and probably put it on before Your Honor,
4 subject to Your Honor's calendar, later in the week.

5 We also have -- I have with me today an order because
6 the trustee has made an investigation and is prepared to
7 approve the transaction, thinks that the transaction is in the
8 best interest of customers and creditors of the SIPC estate
9 including some of the -- or all the changes that have been
10 discussed today. It's a condition of the deal that an order be
11 entered in the SIPC case that essentially adopts the order in
12 the Chapter 11. And we have such an order. And, in fact, we
13 made copies -- we haven't had time to serve it because we've
14 only been appointed, I think, maybe for a matter of two hours.
15 But we did make it -- maybe three hours by now, Your Honor.
16 But we did make it available to as many people as possible here
17 today.

18 And I think with that, if you would entertain hearing
19 briefly from Mr. Giddens --

20 THE COURT: I'd be delighted to hear from him.

21 MR. KOBAC: Good. Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: In fact, I invited this presentation so
23 I'm pleased to have him come to the podium.

24 MR. GIDDENS: Thank you, Your Honor. SIPC and others
25 have been working equally so for a week and I should also say

1 it's been extraordinary -- there's been extraordinary
2 cooperation, 3 a.m. telephone calls, reviewing financial
3 statements with others. The staff of Lehman has been always
4 available. The law firm of Weil Gotshal has been
5 extraordinarily cooperative. And I think again, the response
6 of this extraordinary transaction by the team under Harvey
7 Miller is truly something we're all benefiting from.

8 The SIPC -- looking at this proceeding, I think
9 setting some things in context, when I looked at the balance
10 sheet of the broker dealer a few months ago, the assets were, I
11 think, approximately 497 billion dollars -- or the assets,
12 excuse me, were about 500 billion dollars and the liabilities
13 were 497 billion, which is not unusual for a brokerage firm.
14 Nevertheless, with a pro forma balance sheet which I reviewed
15 with members of the SEC, accountants, people from Lehman,
16 lawyers and others, those assets had decreased because of
17 changes in market from 500 billion to less than a hundred
18 billion. And part of the exercise, of course, with the broker-
19 dealer after -- the first role of a SIPC proceeding is to
20 maintain orderly markets and to try to preserve normalcy for
21 customer accounts. That, I think, has been done here in large
22 measure. There are 629,000 accounts. Through extraordinary
23 efforts a substantial number of those will be transferred.
24 There will remain, by estimate, several thousand, which may
25 take considerable amount of time to resolve disputes,

1 controversies, monies owed to Lehman and the like, which will
2 take some time to deal with. All of those will be dealt with
3 in the context of the SIPC liquidation.

4 Congress created and provided that any -- when a
5 broker-dealer such as SIPC or Merrill Lynch was in financial
6 difficulty it had to be liquidated, it could not be
7 reorganized. And it had to be done so under the specific
8 provisions of the Securities Investor Protection Act, which, in
9 effect, can create certain priorities and preferences for
10 customers. And so that's the first job of a trustee. I think
11 that we have focused on that and spent considerable resources
12 in trying to accomplish that.

13 Nevertheless, as the Federal Reserve, the SEC and
14 other regulators involved in this, there will be considerable
15 assets. Of course, in this proceeding, 500 million, three
16 billion are really deemed to be de minimis numbers. But there
17 are complicated transactions which are in securities and
18 derivatives, private equity investments, all of which will have
19 to be analyzed and resolved in the course of our marshalling
20 the assets of the broker-dealer. The broker-dealer is out of
21 business. They could not conduct additional business after 6
22 p.m. Most of the personnel and typical brokerage assets have
23 been transferred to Barclays or will go to other places.
24 Nevertheless, we will be left with substantial -- there are
25 subsidiaries which have to be, again, mostly dealing with

1 securities and derivatives and the like, whose assets and
2 issues will have to be sorted.

3 It's, I think, the intent of the statute that those
4 kinds of things are dealt with in this proceeding, and we
5 would, of course, intend to work closely with DTC, with
6 regulators, of the SEC in particular, the Federal Reserve,
7 foreign regulators dealing with resolutions to these kinds of
8 issues.

9 So we have many challenges and much work ahead of us.
10 There's no indication we'll have a small amount of money, cash.
11 The liabilities, as best I can determine them, are in the
12 billions. And there are potential assets which are also valued
13 highly on the balance sheet. As to what those assets will be,
14 many of which appear to be -- have decreased, because of market
15 conditions, substantially in value just in a matter of days, I
16 really cannot tell.

17 As I say, we intend to work cooperatively with
18 everyone, try to work quickly and efficiently. Again, we have
19 all the kinds of issues you would have if you -- the residue of
20 any major financial institution. And, again, it's challenging
21 because Lehman was certainly one of the most complex, versatile
22 and finest of the financial institutions globally. And I must
23 say that all early indications are -- the good thing is, unlike
24 other liquidations we've been involved in, there's no
25 indication of sloppy record keeping, missing customer funds and

1 the like. Now, that is not to say, as Mr. Miller indicated,
2 there have already been 300,000 failed transactions just in a
3 matter of days. So it's a complex undertaking that, as I say,
4 we have been working around the clock and will continue to do
5 so to try to resolve those issues, taking care of customers,
6 which is a priority, promoting the orderly transfer of
7 accounts, but also trying to fairly resolve many, many open
8 issues relating to complex securities transactions.

9 So, thank you.

10 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Miller?

11 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I think there may be some
12 other regulators that want to --

13 THE COURT: I didn't realize there were others who
14 wanted to speak in connection with the SIPC proceeding.

15 MR. HIRSHON: Yes, Your Honor. Sheldon Hirshon,
16 Proskauer Rose, representing Depository Trust & Clearing
17 Corporation.

18 I too rise to urge the Court to act on this matter as
19 quickly as possible. And I wanted to explain a little bit more
20 about the plumbing, if you will.

21 The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation is
22 actually the holding company for three separate clearing
23 corporations, DTC, NSCC, and FICC. And the reason that they're
24 somewhat different is because they clear different kinds of
25 securities.

1 You heard that there are roughly 600,000 institution
2 clients and 170,000 retail clients of Lehman. Lehman has an
3 account at DTC and I'll use that globally to refer to each of
4 these clearing corporations. And many, if not all, of the
5 transactions that those customers process come through the DTC.
6 So all of those people are trading through a Lehman account at
7 DTC. DTC, itself, is a securities agency; it's registered
8 under 17A of the 1934 Act. It is supervised by both, the
9 Federal Reserve and the SEC.

10 We have participated along with the other regulatory
11 agencies to facilitate this transaction. The magnitude of the
12 transaction as you've now heard, the number of trades that come
13 through, the 300,000 failed trades, meaning that there hasn't
14 been a delivery either on one side that is a sale or buy. All
15 of those have to be worked out and we need to really focus on
16 that and hopefully understand what that is and maybe even clear
17 most, if not all of them, by Monday when the market reopens.
18 And we hope to have transferred the accounts from Lehman to
19 Barclays so that it would be seamless. So that when the
20 customer calls up on Monday to place an order it will be
21 prosecuted and then cleared.

22 So that's why we've risen to urge the Court to
23 consider this. It is an extraordinary moment. And in order to
24 keep the market stabilized and have an opening on Monday where
25 Barclays can trade as if it were Lehman, we need to have this

1 transaction approved today and as early in the evening as
2 possible so then we can go back to our offices and do the work
3 we need to do, sign the various documents to transfer, and get
4 all the regulatory approvals that are required.

5 Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, taking Mr. Hirshon's cue
8 from what he just said, I would propose, Your Honor, as direct
9 testimony, that we would offer a proffer at this time.

10 THE COURT: That's fine. But Mr. Bienenstock is
11 raising his hand, however, and may have an issue.

12 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Your Honor, as I think Your Honor
13 anticipated, the issues here are mostly legal rights with the
14 relief they're going to be requesting. I've asked three times
15 for the proposed order, which at the recess they said has
16 changed. It's in the courtroom, I'm told.

17 Before I agree to a proffer, as opposed to the
18 witnesses, I'd like to see -- and for due process, I'd like to
19 see the relief being requested in writing, that's what this
20 hearing is all about at this point, I think.

21 THE COURT: All right. Well, let's deal with that.
22 And maybe in light of the fact that you're actively
23 participating at this moment, and given the awkwardness of the
24 distance from the bench and microphones, we can have Mr.
25 Bienenstock walk through the gauntlet and come to the front of

1 the courtroom.

2 Apparently, there will be others joining him and --

3 MR. GOLDEN: Your Honor, I just want to make sure --
4 we don't have an objection --

5 THE COURT: You have to identify yourself by name,
6 even though I know you.

7 MR. GOLDEN: Daniel Golden Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &
8 Feld, counsel for an ad hoc bondholders group.

9 We have no objection to proceeding by proffer as long
10 as the proffered witness will be available for cross-
11 examination.

12 THE COURT: That's fine.

13 MR. MILLER: I was only offering direct testimony,
14 Your Honor, as a proffer.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Bienenstock, do you wish to
16 comment -- I view what you said as an objection to proceeding
17 by means of proffer until such time as there is a writing that
18 clarifies the relief being sought in the pending motion at this
19 moment. Do I understand your position correctly?

20 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Yes, Your Honor, with one step
21 further. I really think, based on all of the circumstances,
22 it's enough that everyone showed up at 4 p.m. without knowing
23 what deal was being proposed. Not pointing fingers, again,
24 Your Honor, but these are just how the facts unfolded.

25 We not only knew -- didn't know the deal being

1 proposed, we didn't know and do not know at this instant the
2 relief being requested, and yet this hearing is going forward.
3 It's really -- I don't think I've ever had occasion in my
4 career to make such a due process argument, but the facts
5 compel it. I'd like to see the relief being requested before
6 this proceeds. Whether by proffer or by live witness. And I
7 think everybody, including the Court, should know what's the
8 relief being requested.

9 THE COURT: Well, I'll let Mr. Miller respond to
10 that, but I'm going to give you a reaction to what you just
11 said, too.

12 I've attempted to distill and digest from my own
13 understanding the various objections that have been filed,
14 including the objection that you filed. And many of the
15 objections, but not all of them, raise questions as to
16 vagueness in the asset purchase agreement, ambiguous provisions
17 in the asset purchase agreement, concerns with respect to the
18 sale of nondebtor assets, and confusion associated with the
19 speed with which the transaction is proceeding that makes it
20 more difficult for parties-in-interest to comprehend precisely
21 how they're affected by the transaction. In fact, you said
22 much the same thing differently on Wednesday on behalf of your
23 clients.

24 But I also understand that since Wednesday, in a
25 process of a cooperative information sharing, as opposed to

1 coercive discovery, there have been many opportunities offered
2 to parties such as your client and you. I have no idea what
3 happened and I don't need to know that right now. But my
4 working premise is that in a manner somewhat comparable to the
5 level of cooperation described by the SIPC trustee that has
6 existed between the regulators and the SIPC trustee and Mr.
7 Miller's firm in making this dramatically emergent transaction
8 happen, that through discovery -- informal discovery, parties-
9 in-interest, including the creditors' committee, has gotten to
10 the point of at least acquiescing because the transaction is so
11 significant to the markets, to the employees, to the U.S.
12 economy, to the world economy.

13 I think I know what's going on here, and I'm not
14 saying that you necessarily know how your client's rights are
15 affected. But I have a pretty good idea, even with the
16 modifications that I've only heard about as recently as when I
17 took the bench an hour or two ago, I can't remember what time
18 it was. I understand this deal, not in every aspect but
19 certainly in broad outline. I have notice. This is a
20 hearing. I believe that for due process purposes we are all
21 here with, perhaps cobbled together notice, but it's notice.
22 The form of order undoubtedly is something that parties will be
23 arguing about. But I believe that it is not a necessary
24 precondition to proceeding with the hearing that parties know
25 more in terms of what's before me. Because unless you have

1 another argument to make, I'm satisfied that I know the relief
2 that's being sought.

3 In conjunction with the SIPC proceeding,
4 substantially all of the going concern value that exists within
5 these assets is to be preserved. Assets, principally the real
6 estate, will be sold for a value that I've already questioned.
7 The essential terms of the transaction, with modifications,
8 have been understood at least for the last few days.

9 What I think you're addressing, and I don't want to
10 speak for you, is that there are particulars of the transaction
11 as it affects your client that you're still uncertain about. I
12 believe that we should proceed with proof. Everybody's rights
13 are reserved. If there's a need for a witness to testify live
14 on cross-examination after a proffer, the witness is available
15 and will be exposed to cross-examination. If there's an
16 objection to proceeding by means of proffer, this is the time
17 to make that objection. So question one is do we or don't we
18 at least offer the direct by means of a proffer?

19 MR. BIENENSTOCK: If you're asking for my response
20 first, it's --

21 THE COURT: It might as well be because you're right
22 there.

23 MR. BIENENSTOCK: If the debtor will demonstrate its
24 cooperation and give us the proposed order so we can read it, I
25 would have no objection proceeding by proffer. Otherwise, I do

1 object.

2 MR. MILLER: Here's the order.

3 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. BIENENSTOCK: I have no objection to proceeding
6 by proffer.

7 THE COURT: All right. That must be the most
8 difficult request for a form of order I have ever seen. Mr.
9 Sabin?

10 MR. SABIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jeffrey
11 Sabin from Bingham McCutchen on behalf of Harbinger Capital
12 Special Situations and Harbinger Capital Partners Master Fund.

13 I rise not to object to the proposed proffer. And we
14 did file a limited objection. And based upon what we have
15 heard before you took the bench in the interim, and based upon
16 what you heard from Ms. Fife when we presumed this hearing, we
17 have two other clarifications that perhaps could be part of the
18 proffer that I think we heard. And assuming that these two
19 representations are indeed part of the proffer and the process
20 is otherwise as you described with respective parties-in-
21 interest participating in getting to a fully consensual order,
22 our objection would be resolved.

23 So let me first talk about those two additional
24 things that I understood are material, enough at least to my
25 client, to put it on the record at this point. First, that no

1 assets of any of the nondebtors, whether in this Chapter 11
2 cases or in the SIPC proceeding are being sold as part of this
3 transaction. And we would seek that representation, not only
4 from the debtors, but from the purchaser and from the SIPC
5 trustee.

6 THE COURT: I hate to break in on that. But if I
7 heard what Ms. Fife had to say, there are some nondebtor assets
8 that I believe are being sold. Lehman Canada, Lehman
9 Sudamerica and Lehman Uruguay S.A.

10 MR. SABIN: I believe, Your Honor, that would be an
11 asset of LBHI, the parent. And the asset being sold is stock
12 so that you would have jurisdiction. Just to clarify for the
13 record.

14 MR. DESPINS: Your Honor, I apologize, but I believe
15 their real estate is owned by -- is it all owned by the
16 debtors? The New Jersey real estate as well?

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

18 MR. DESPINS: I apologize, Your Honor. It's a
19 limited liability company which the debtor owes ninety-nine
20 percent.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Sabin, before you proceed with your
22 remarks, just because I think for good order you should have
23 the full attention of the bench and the full attention of those
24 who are in the room, pause for a minute, because there's some
25 movement that I'm finding distracting. Mostly having to do

1 with the passing out of the form of order so that Mr.
2 Bienenstock's ability to review it is not an exclusive
3 privilege.

4 Why don't you proceed?

5 MR. SABIN: Thank you, Your Honor. So to be precise,
6 after the various comments I'll go back to what I believe to be
7 the understanding of an additional material term, if you will,
8 that will be set forth in a so-called six-page clarification
9 letter that will constitute an amendment to the as-filed
10 version of the APA. And that is a representation, or as part
11 of the proffer, which is supported also not only by the debtors
12 but by the purchaser and by the SIPC trustee, that no assets of
13 any nondebtors, whether in the Chapter 11 cases or in the SIPC
14 proceeding are being sold as part of this transaction.

15 And for clarity, I understand from the remarks of Ms.
16 Fife, that there are certain equity interests that constitute
17 property of the estate of one or more of these debtors that
18 will now be part of this transaction.

19 MS. FIFE: Your Honor, if I may?

20 THE COURT: Sure.

21 MS. FIFE: During the break that issue came up. And
22 I responded that there were no nondebtor assets being sold.
23 However, I was incorrect in one very small way. There is some
24 intellectual property that is held by nondebtors that is
25 primarily used and necessary for the LBI business, and that is

1 being sold pursuant to this transaction. Other than that, no
2 other nondebtor assets are being sold.

3 THE COURT: Is this intellectual property held in a
4 special purpose entity?

5 MS. FIFE: We're not exactly sure what entity it's
6 held in. I wouldn't say, though, it's a special purpose. It's
7 perhaps spread out through other subsidiaries.

8 THE COURT: Okay. It sounds like there's some
9 nondebtor property, but it's IPR.

10 MR. SABIN: I'm just going to reserve for that part
11 of our objection related to this issue. But it doesn't sound
12 like it's a material asset that is part of the transaction
13 itself.

14 Number two, in that same session where Your Honor was
15 not in participation, we understand that so-called master
16 netting agreements and securities contracts, other than those
17 already owned as of today by Barclays, will not be part of the
18 sale by LBI in this transaction.

19 THE COURT: In making that statement, are you seeking
20 a clarification that what you had just said is true?

21 MR. SABIN: I am, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Who's going to confirm that, if it's, in
23 fact, true?

24 Maybe that will have to be confirmed at some other
25 time.

1 For record purposes, it's unclear what just happened.

2 MR. SABIN: I think, let the record reflect that the
3 parties with knowledge will confer and hopefully we will
4 resolve it and get an answer on the record.

5 THE COURT: Fine.

6 MR. SABIN: The additional matters, Your Honor, that
7 we have a concern with, which of course, were not facts known
8 when we filed our objection, deal with the intent and maybe
9 it's already an act of the SIPC trustee. With respect to the
10 existing five corporate entities that are subsidiaries, as we
11 understand it, of LBI, which is now subject to the SIPC
12 proceeding. And whether or not any or all of those entities
13 will indeed become, or have become, as we sit here, debtors,
14 whether in Chapter 11 or Chapter 7, especially given our
15 understanding that the proceeds going to LBI are just 250
16 million dollars. And given our understanding that many of the
17 employees who may have otherwise supported the services of some
18 or all of those entities will no longer be supporting those
19 entities.

20 Other than that, Your Honor, no longer delay. And I
21 will turn the podium to Mr. Miller to go forward with the
22 proffer.

23 THE COURT: I don't think you received a
24 clarification on that last point. Is that something that can
25 be clarified now or should it be clarified later?

1 My suggestion is for good order that we, at some
2 point, have a break. You and others will have an opportunity
3 to meet and confer and gain some additional information. And
4 that we proceed by way of proffer unless there's someone else
5 who has something to say on that subject.

6 MR. SABIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 MR. MILLER: Harvey Miller, Your Honor, for the
9 debtors, again.

10 If Your Honor please, I would offer proffer, the
11 testimony of Herbert H. McDade. If Mr. McDade, Your Honor,
12 were called to the stand to testify, he would testify to the
13 following effect:

14 Mr. McDade received a Bachelor of Arts degree from
15 Duke University and a Masters of Business Administration from
16 the University of Michigan.

17 After joining Lehman Holdings in 1983, Mr. McDade was
18 named head of Corporate Bond Department in 1991. In 1998 he
19 was named global head of Debt Capital Markets. In 2002 Mr.
20 McDade was named to Lehman Holdings Operating Committee. He
21 has served as global head of the Fixed Income Division for the
22 period June 2002 through 2005. In June of 2005 Mr. McDade
23 assumed the responsibilities of the global head of Equities
24 Division. Mr. McDade has over twenty-five years of experience
25 in managing a company's financial operations.

1 Mr. McDade would testify that Lehman Holdings'
2 predecessor was founded in 1850. Since that time Lehman
3 Holdings grew into the fourth largest investment bank in the
4 world. He would testify that through Lehman Holdings'
5 subsidiaries, it is a global market maker in all major equity
6 and fixed income products. Lehman Holdings' subsidiaries are
7 members of all principal securities and commodities exchanges
8 in the United States, including FINRA and the NYSE. And
9 memberships on several principal international securities and
10 commodities exchanges, including London, Tokyo, Hong Kong,
11 Frankfurt, Paris, Milan, Singapore and Australia.

12 Lehman is a global leader -- was a global leader in
13 equity and fixed income sales, trading and research, investment
14 banking, private investment management, asset management and
15 private equity.

16 Mr. McDade would testify that the tightening of the
17 U.S. and international markets caused Lehman Brothers to
18 experience a severe liquidity crisis.

19 Now Lehman Holdings' broker-dealer subsidiary, Lehman
20 Brothers Inc., relies to a large extent upon funding from
21 Lehman Holdings, which is the public company and the issuer of
22 debt -- unsecured debt that provides funds for the entire
23 organization. And that such funding is no longer available to
24 provide to Lehman and LBI.

25 And as each hour has passed and uncertainty is

1 prolonged, investor's faith in the market has weakened the
2 value of Lehman's business and it has rapidly deteriorated.

3 The state of affairs at Lehman Brothers Holding Inc.
4 and LBI is critical and their fate just jeopardizes their
5 affiliates' ability to conduct business.

6 Absent approval of the Barclays' transaction, the
7 broker-dealer business would discontinue as a going concern and
8 adversely impact the credit markets on a global scale in ways
9 that are immeasurable.

10 He would testify that Lehman Brothers and its
11 advisors have literally spent every hour attempting to preserve
12 Lehman Holdings' estate and LBI's broker-dealer business.

13 Other than the liquidity crisis, Lehman has been
14 facing pressure and constraints from regulators and agencies.
15 The Federal Reserve, the SEC, the CFTC and other governmental
16 entities have been putting constant pressure on Lehman to
17 engage a prospective buyer and consummate a sale of the broker-
18 dealer business, no later than today, so that there is a
19 seamless transition to preserve the business.

20 Other than the pressures from regulators, Mr. McDade
21 would testify that the broker-dealer's customers are in a state
22 of panic. Vendors are threatening to stop providing services.
23 Lehman is experiencing severe internal pressures. He would
24 testify that it would be an understatement to state that the
25 morale of the employees is low. Employees have and will

1 continue to defect. And the images on television of employees
2 streaming out of the Seventh Avenue headquarters with boxes and
3 suitcases with their possessions is self-evident proof of what
4 is happening.

5 He would testify that the broker-dealer business
6 services over 600,000 customer accounts, and that it could take
7 several months to transfer all of the accounts in the ordinary
8 course of business. In its current state the broker-dealer
9 does not have sufficient capital to service its customer
10 accounts while transferring them to another broker-dealer in
11 the ordinary course of business. The market value of customer
12 accounts is in the hundreds of billions.

13 Mr. McDade would testify that the broker-dealer is
14 dependent upon financing from Lehman Holdings Inc., the holding
15 company during the period prior to the Chapter 11 case.
16 Without access to financing, the broker-dealer is incapable of
17 servicing its customer accounts. As a result, the broker-
18 dealer would have no choice but to close its customer accounts
19 and that would result in billions of dollars of losses and
20 damages.

21 If the broker-dealer is not able to settle trades, a
22 SIPC trustee will commence a proceeding and there has been a
23 proceeding commenced consistent with the transaction that is
24 being proposed.

25 Mr. McDade would testify that during the past ten

1 days, he and Lehman's senior management, have been in constant
2 communications with Lehman's regulators. The regulators are,
3 for now, very supportive of the current transaction. In an
4 effort to facilitate the transaction, the SIPC trustee agreed
5 not to freeze customer accounts when the broker-dealer was
6 placed into a SIPC proceeding.

7 The regulators and agencies support the Barclays'
8 transaction. But they have made clear to Lehman that their
9 patience is limited and they are placing tremendous pressure on
10 all parties to close a transaction no later than today. The
11 state of Lehman's affairs have been widely publicized the world
12 over.

13 It has been widely reported in the media that Lehman,
14 its senior management and advisors have participated in
15 numerous meetings conducted by the Federal Reserve Bank. At
16 these meetings, the Federal Reserve Bank and Lehman met with
17 numerous financial institutions to attempt to find the solution
18 to the problem of Lehman's financial condition.

19 Also, as widely reported in the media, the financial
20 institutions that participated in those meetings included some
21 of the largest banks in the country.

22 Notwithstanding the help from regulators and other
23 governmental agencies, Lehman was not successful in reaching an
24 agreement with any of these parties as to a support for
25 continued operations.

1 Mr. McDade would testify that he first became
2 involved with this particular transaction Monday morning --
3 last Monday morning, I guess that was September 15, at 7 a.m.
4 in the morning. Since that time, he has been in constant
5 contact with senior management and Lehman's outside advisors
6 regarding the status and progression of the negotiations. The
7 negotiations leading up to the Barclays' transaction have been
8 at arm's length, objective, aggressively pursued by Barclays
9 and difficult, to say the least, Your Honor.

10 He would testify that since the collapse of Bear
11 Stearns and a subsequent takeover by JPMorgan, the Federal
12 Reserve Bank has made financing available to broker-dealers in
13 what is colloquially referred to as the window.

14 After the broker-dealer settles its trade at the
15 close of business, the clearing bank returns the collateral,
16 which Lehman then transfers to the Federal Reserve in exchange
17 for financing until the opening of business the next day. That
18 process, as the liquidity of Lehman's deteriorated, no longer
19 became possible.

20 He would testify that in the climate of today's
21 market, a potential buyer of the broker-dealer business could
22 not operate without having access to the PDCF, the Primary
23 Dealer Credit Facility. That facility is not available to all
24 broker-dealers. Rather, it is available only to a limited
25 number of financial institutions who could meet the rules and

1 regulations of the Federal Reserve in respect thereof. And
2 that, Your Honor, is probably less than a dozen institutions.

3 He would testify that during the period of stress and
4 strain, the week before this week, Lehman attempted to interest
5 the Bank of America in an acquisition of Lehman's, and that,
6 unfortunately, did not come to fruition. At the same time, it
7 was negotiating an acquisition by Barclays of the Lehman
8 business. And that negotiation led to what I might call an
9 agreement that was subject to the -- he would testify it was
10 subject to the regulators throughout the world, and,
11 unfortunately, it became clear that that agreement could not be
12 consummated.

13 And immediately after that announcement was made, he
14 would testify that he and other officers of Lehman were called
15 to the Federal Reserve Bank in New York to meet with the
16 Federal Reserve Bank representatives, the SEC, and the United
17 States Treasury to deal with the problem confronting Lehman's.
18 And those meetings, he would testify, took place, Your Honor,
19 Sunday morning and ran into the late evening of that day. In
20 which it was made perfectly clear that it was necessary for the
21 protection of the public and the financial markets in an effort
22 to placate the public markets, or at least stabilize the
23 situation, that it is in the best interest of all parties that
24 Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. commence a Chapter 11 proceeding.
25 And that it maintain, for LBI, access to the so-called window.

1 And it was in that context, he would testify, that LBI was
2 enabled to go forward, at least for the past week.

3 He would also testify, Your Honor, Barclays, unlike
4 some of the larger and healthier financial institutions that
5 might qualify for access to the PDCF, does not have a North
6 American broker-dealer operation of this scale. Therefore, the
7 sale is a national extension of Barclays' business. Barclays
8 would have access to the PDCF and also will assume Lehman's
9 broad spectrum broker-dealer license.

10 Not only is this sale a good match economically but
11 it saves the jobs of thousands of employees and avoids losses
12 that could total in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

13 He would further testify, Your Honor, that he is
14 familiar with the asset purchase agreement, that he
15 participated in all of the negotiations involved in the asset
16 purchase agreement. And that those negotiations from time to
17 time broke out into different teams, but he was the team leader
18 for Lehman.

19 He would testify that the asset purchase agreement
20 provides for the sale of the North American broker-dealer
21 business of LBI, which includes banking and capital markets
22 business in addition to numerous other divisions.

23 The Seventh Avenue headquarters is being transferred
24 to Barclays, in addition to the various offices located
25 throughout the United States, that are integral to the broker-

1 dealer business. The value of the real estate being
2 transferred to Barclays pursuant to the transaction is subject
3 to negotiation with respect of the appraised values. That the
4 building on Seventh Avenue is subject to an appraisal which has
5 been provided to Barclays. And that appraisal is in the area
6 of 900 million dollars to 100 million dollars. And that the
7 appraisal was done by CB Richard Ellis. And it was prepared
8 for the other debtor in this case, LB 745 LLC and Barclays
9 Capital Inc. And it is a voluminous appraisal of the
10 properties which we will offer into evidence at the appropriate
11 time, Your Honor.

12 And that he would also testify that an appraisal of
13 the two data centers was also directed and that CB Richard
14 Ellis was also engaged to undertake that appraisal. And that
15 appraisal has established the value for the purpose of the
16 negotiations, Your Honor. And as pointed out earlier in the
17 proceeding, those values have come in at slightly less -- I
18 shouldn't say slightly, less than was originally projected.

19 So that was a very negotiated term, and the reason
20 for the transfer of these properties, Your Honor, is that they
21 are integral to the smooth transition of the businesses.

22 Barclays will also assume exposure for the employees
23 that accept offers of employment, which is estimated to have a
24 value of approximately -- an exposure of approximately two
25 billion dollars.

1 Barclays is also assuming the cure amounts relating
2 to contracts and leases that will be assumed pursuant to the
3 asset purchase agreement. And that has a potential exposure,
4 Your Honor, of 1.5 billion dollars that he would testify to.

5 Barclays is also paying the real estate transfer
6 taxes, which are estimated to be approximately thirty million
7 dollars.

8 Mr. McDade would testify that the financial community
9 has known that Lehman has been under stress for some time.
10 Certainly, going back to the time that Bear Sterns was bailed
11 out. Potential purchasers have known that Lehman has been
12 searching for a buyer since well before the Chapter 11 case
13 commenced. And that those ethics, those strategic alternatives
14 that were being pursued involved parts of Lehman as well as the
15 whole of Lehman. And that the notoriety attached to that did
16 not produce any interested parties other than the ones I
17 mentioned -- he mentioned.

18 During the meeting at the Federal Reserve Bank last
19 week, Bank of America, JPMorgan, Merrill Lynch and Barclays
20 were all present, showing interest in the broker-dealer assets.
21 It was clear to each party that if Lehman was unable to reach a
22 deal it would most likely have to commence cases under Chapter
23 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. That would not only have an adverse
24 impact upon their businesses but also upon the international
25 markets.

1 He would testify that since the commencement of the
2 Chapter 11 case, Lehman's senior management and its advisors
3 have not undertaken an intensive marketing of the business and
4 the assets to be sold. But instead focused on reaching an
5 agreement with the most eligible interested buyer for these
6 assets.

7 That notwithstanding the lack of a specific program
8 for marketing, the sale of Lehman's broker-dealer business has
9 been known worldwide. And, yet, he would say nobody has
10 expressed an interest to step into the shoes of -- excuse me,
11 step into the shoes of Barclays, Your Honor.

12 Lehman has not received any other interest since the
13 commencement of the Chapter 11 cases. If Lehman was approached
14 by another potential buyer that he would consider the offer,
15 provided that the company had sufficient liquidity to operate
16 the business without jeopardizing customer accounts. That has
17 not happened, Your Honor. So it is almost academic.

18 Mr. McDade would testify, Your Honor, that if the
19 sale with Barclays is consummated, customer accounts would
20 continue on a seamless, uninterrupted basis and trading would
21 continue on a normal basis, thereby maintaining the billions of
22 dollars in value.

23 At the same time, the jobs of thousands of employees
24 would be saved and will be entitled to substantial benefits
25 from Barclays in the form of compensation, bonuses and

1 severance payments that are based upon the employee's prior
2 performance while with Lehman.

3 He would testify to the consummation of the
4 transactions makes available a greater pool of assets to the
5 debtors' estates, because the exposure under Lehman Holdings
6 guarantee to the broker-dealer will be substantially less. If
7 the transaction does not close today or over this weekend, Your
8 Honor, Mr. McDade would testify that the effect on the broker-
9 dealers business and on Lehman Holdings would be devastating.
10 First, the failure to consummate the transaction would cause
11 default under the DIP facility and require Lehman Holdings to
12 repay the outstanding amounts under that facility.

13 He would testify that the liabilities in the hundreds
14 of billions of dollars would be triggered against Lehman
15 Holdings which would in turn deplete the property available to
16 distribution to creditors. It would adversely affect the
17 debtors other nondebtor subsidiaries to the extent they have
18 any value.

19 He would testify, Your Honor, that if the transaction
20 is not consummated, it will result in the largest failure of a
21 broker-dealer in the history of the United States and will
22 cripple the credit markets for some time to come.

23 He would further testify, Your Honor, that the shock
24 of this transaction not being consummated in the public markets
25 could be immeasurable and could ignite a panic in the financial

1 condition that we now face in the United States.

2 He would testify that it is essential to an orderly
3 financial market that this transaction be consummated as early
4 as possible in the interest of all stakeholders of these two
5 cases. And in the interest of the public in general and the
6 economy in general, and to avoid a dislocation in the market,
7 Your Honor.

8 Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: And that concludes the proffer?

10 MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Is there anyone who wishes to cross-
12 examine Mr. McDade with respect to the proffer or may I simply
13 accept the proffer in the form it has been offered by Mr.
14 Miller without further examination?

15 MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, Abid Qureshi, Akin, Gump,
16 Strauss, Hauer & Feld on behalf of an ad hoc group of
17 noteholders of LBHI. We would like to cross-examine the
18 witness.

19 THE COURT: All right. Mr. McDade should come to the
20 stand then.

21 (Witness is sworn)

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. QURESHI:

24 **Q. Good evening, Mr. McDade. You testified through the**
25 **proffer that you were involved in the negotiations concerning**

1 the asset purchase agreement, correct?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And, sir, did you also attend a meeting that was held with
4 creditors this past Wednesday at Weil Gotshal?

5 A. Yes, I did.

6 Q. I'd like to talk first, if we could, about the real estate
7 assets. What was the expectation of the debtors with respect
8 to the headquarter's building at 745 Seventh Avenue at the time
9 the original asset purchase agreement was signed up with
10 Barclays in terms of the value of that building?

11 A. The headquarters building, approximately a billion
12 dollars.

13 Q. So that was the expectation at the time that you first
14 entered into the asset purchase agreement with Barclays?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And at that time, sir, what was the debtors' expectation
17 concerning the value of the two other real estate assets
18 located in New Jersey?

19 A. The two data centers totaled 450 million.

20 Q. And is it your testimony today, sir, that the appraisal
21 with respect to the headquarters building performed by CBRE
22 appraised the value at 900 million, is that correct?

23 A. I don't know.

24 Q. You don't know what the appraised value is? Do you
25 know -- were you involved with discussions with Barclays

1 concerning the appraised value of the headquarters building?

2 A. I was involved with the negotiations in terms of the
3 process with respect to the purchase of the building and the
4 process with respect to getting the appraised value. I have
5 not been involved since, directly. The team has.

6 Q. Do you know if the appraised value, whatever it is, of the
7 headquarters building, is something that has been agreed upon
8 between Lehman and Barclays?

9 A. The appraised value of the building is still to be
10 negotiated, as Mr. Miller suggested earlier.

11 Q. So you do not know what CBRE concluded the appraised value
12 was in their review of the headquarters building?

13 A. The team has been involved in that, I have not been
14 directly involved.

15 Q. Okay. Sir, with respect to the two buildings located in
16 New Jersey, are you aware of what the appraised value is of
17 those buildings?

18 A. I would answer in the same way, the team has been
19 involved.

20 Q. You personally have not?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And, again, Lehman's expectation going in was that the
23 approximate value of those two building was 450 million?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. And is it your understanding that it's materially less

1 than that today?

2 A. Materially less -- again, I have not seen the final
3 documents in terms of the appraisal.

4 Q. Okay. With respect to the appraisals of those two
5 buildings in New Jersey, again, has that appraised value,
6 although it's an unknown to you, do you know whether that
7 appraised value has been agreed upon between Barclays and --

8 A. No, it has not, to be negotiated.

9 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding, sir, that with respect to
10 the transfer of these real estate assets to Barclays that there
11 is any broker fee involved?

12 A. My understanding is from the negotiation, again, that a
13 suggested broker fee was part of the negotiation to take place,
14 yes.

15 Q. And do you know what the magnitude of that suggested
16 broker fee is?

17 A. I do not.

18 Q. Okay. Do you have any approximate idea of what it might
19 be? Are we talking tens of millions, fifty million or do we
20 not know?

21 A. I do not know.

22 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding, sir, that there actually
23 will be a broker fee payable to a broker as a result of the
24 transfer of these assets?

25 A. There is not an individual broker involved.

1 Q. So there is no actual broker fee that will be paid, but
2 value will be deducted from the appraised value for the benefit
3 of Barclays, is that correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Sir, just to switch gears and to talk about the businesses
6 that are being sold from LBI to Barclays, are there any
7 businesses remaining at LBI that are not being transferred to
8 Barclays?

9 A. No.

10 Q. And with respect to the contracts that are associated with
11 each of the various businesses that are being acquired by
12 Barclays, do each of those contracts also reside at LBI?

13 A. The contracts with respect to the underlying products?

14 Q. Let's start more broadly, the contracts with respect to
15 the running of each of those businesses, generally?

16 A. I'm not quite certain I understand the specifics of the
17 question. The assets of those business units, the people of
18 the business units will be moving to Barclays. The individual
19 businesses have different assets and securities and
20 derivatives, obviously, that they're responsible for trading.
21 The contracts, themselves, in terms of the business units, I'm
22 not certain I understand the question.

23 Q. Okay. Are the trading contracts with respect to the
24 various products that each of those businesses operates in, are
25 those contracts going to the purchaser?

1 A. The specific question has yet to be determined, given the
2 dynamic nature and speed of which we're operating. Each of the
3 individual businesses will enter into a series of very quick
4 next steps to determine how we actually transact in each of
5 those business units going forward.

6 Q. And who will determine which of those contracts go to the
7 purchaser and which of those contracts stay behind? Will that
8 be something in Barclays' discretion, or is that Lehman's
9 decision?

10 A. That will be a mutual process.

11 Q. And is it your understanding, sir, that all of the
12 contracts that are to be negotiated, in terms of whether they
13 stay or whether they go, are contracts that reside at LBI? Or
14 are any of those contracts that reside at other Lehman
15 entities?

16 A. LBI.

17 Q. And, sir, can you also please confirm if it is your
18 understanding that the purchased assets do not include
19 Neuberger Berman or any of its assets?

20 A. Yes, I affirm that.

21 Q. Okay. Sir, are you aware of whether -- do you know what a
22 closing balance sheet is?

23 A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. Okay. And do you know whether a closing balance sheet was
25 prepared in connection with this transaction?

1 A. I am not aware of that.

2 Q. Okay. Assuming that one was not, do you have any
3 understanding of why one was not?

4 A. The speed of which we're operating.

5 Q. Well, in the absence of a closing balance sheet having
6 been prepared, can you please describe for the Court how it is
7 that the debtor determined that fair value was being realized
8 for the sale of these assets?

9 A. For the assets?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. The individual assets on the balance sheet, the trading
12 inventory was bottoms up, meaning individual line item detail
13 processed through all of our individual risk business units in
14 coordination with the normal finance professionals who are
15 incorporated into the valuation process.

16 Q. Did the debtors have any form of valuations of any of the
17 assets that are being transferred?

18 A. Sorry?

19 Q. Does Lehman have any valuations -- internal valuations of
20 any of the assets that are being transferred to Barclays?

21 A. Absolutely. There are many complex securities involved.
22 Many different models that we use to evaluate those securities.

23 Q. And so, sir, is it your testimony then that a valuation
24 was conducted within Lehman of all of the assets that are being
25 transferred to Barclays? When was that conducted?

1 A. Portfolio moved during the week, but that was conducted
2 all last evening. All through and up to the arrangement -- the
3 agreement today.

4 Q. And, sir, was it the case that at the time of the meeting
5 that took place with creditors this past Wednesday, LBI had
6 approximately --

7 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Your Honor, Thursday.

8 MR. QURESHI: I apologize, it was Thursday.

9 THE COURT: I'll take that as an objection to the
10 question, and it's sustained.

11 Q. Am I correct, sir, in understanding that at that time
12 creditors were told that LBI had approximately 1.3 billion
13 dollars in cash?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Okay. And at that time, the deal was that 700 million of
16 those funds would go to Barclays, and the remaining 600 million
17 would stay at LBI?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And what is the cash balance at LBI today?

20 A. It's virtually nil.

21 Q. Where did it go?

22 A. To the CME. Liquidation of the CME trades. And to all
23 the other clearing banks involved in processing of the
24 transactions this week.

25 Q. Sir, since the time that the agreement was first entered

1 into with Barclays early in the week, are you aware of any
2 affirmative efforts of having been undertaken on behalf of
3 Lehman to shop these assets to any other potential purchasers?

4 A. The assets, specifically, the inventory assets?

5 Q. The assets being acquired by Barclays or any subset of
6 those?

7 A. No. Nor -- no.

8 MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, may I have one moment,
9 please?

10 THE COURT: Sure.

11 Q. Sir, are you familiar, generally, with the terms of the
12 DIP financing agreement?

13 A. Generally.

14 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that if the transaction
15 with Barclays does not close, that that would constitute a
16 default under the DIP?

17 A. Thirty days to repay. It's thirty days to repay.

18 Q. So it would trigger a thirty-day repayment of it?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay.

21 MR. QURESHI: Thank you, Your Honor, that's all I
22 have.

23 THE COURT: Is there anyone else who wishes to
24 examine the witness?

25 MR. ROSNER: Your Honor, if you can see me, I'm right

1 here. I'd like to --

2 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Bienenstock is ahead of you.
3 So you're going to have to move to a position where you can
4 both be seen and heard.

5 Mr. Bienenstock, it's your turn.

6 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. BIENENSTOCK:

9 Q. Good evening, Mr. McDade.

10 A. Good evening.

11 Q. My name is Martin Bienenstock, representing the Walt
12 Disney Company. Yesterday, I understand that you were at the
13 information session at Weil Gotshal?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. And I want to confirm some information given there.
16 Pursuant to the proposed asset purchase agreement here, the
17 businesses that are being -- the Lehman businesses being
18 transferred to Barclays are as follows: Tell me if I'm
19 incorrect, I'll read one at a time. Investment Banking?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Fixed Income?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. North American Operations?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Credit?

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. Lending?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. Municipal Bonds?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Commodities?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. High Yield?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Derivatives?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Government Bonds?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Interest rates derivatives?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. High grade credit?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Cash and credit derivatives?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Money market?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Commercial paper?
- 23 A. That's the same.
- 24 Q. Commercial lending?
- 25 A. Commercial lending, if you mean the leverage finance

1 business, yes.

2 Q. Foreign exchange trading?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Prime brokerage?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Prime services?

7 A. That's the same business.

8 Q. Sorry, I'm not familiar.

9 A. No problem.

10 Q. Cash equities?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. Convertible bonds?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Long/short proprietary trading?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Customer options and futures?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Equity prime brokerage?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And to transfer those businesses, I take it, the one

21 necessary component is the transfer of employees to Barclay?

22 A. Absolutely.

23 Q. And how many employees did you say will be going over to

24 Barclays?

25 A. Approximately 9,000.

1 Q. And at Lehman Brothers and its subsidiary entities, do
2 employees work across legal entities in business lines or is
3 there a different employee for each legal entity?

4 A. Most of the employees in the U.S. work for the U.S.
5 broker-dealer, LBI. Most of the LBH employees were actually
6 corporate functions, operations financed technology which
7 supported the capital markets units in particular.

8 Q. So the employees then who worked for Lehman Brothers
9 Commercial Corp. are technically employees of LBI, is that
10 correct?

11 A. Lehman Brothers Commercial Corp.?

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. I'm not familiar with that legal entity.

14 Q. Foreign exchange trading?

15 A. Foreign exchange trading, yes.

16 Q. Okay. And Lehman Brothers Finance, are those employees
17 employees of -- are the employees who operate Lehman Brothers
18 Finance, are they employees of LBI?

19 A. Lehman Brothers Finance, you mean the finance professional
20 staff?

21 Q. I think the technical name is Lehman Brothers Finance S.A.

22 A. Lehman Brothers Finance S.A. is one of our derivative
23 subsidiaries.

24 Q. Okay. And the employees who work that business are
25 employees of LBI?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And the same goes for Lehman Brothers Equity Finance
3 (Cayman) Ltd.?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. And for Lehman Brothers Commercial Corporation Asia Ltd.?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And for Lehman Brothers Bankhaus A.G. Seoul branch?

8 A. That's a funding vehicle, it's a bank.

9 Q. Okay. And for Lehman Brothers Commodity Services, Inc.?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Are you sure you have no recollection of Lehman Brothers
12 Commercial Corp., LBCC?

13 A. No, I do not.

14 Q. Okay. But, in general, the subsidiaries of Lehman
15 Brothers Inc. and Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. use employees
16 of those two entities?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. So as a consequence of this asset purchase agreement if
19 it's closed, the businesses and those subsidiaries will have to
20 be wound down, is that fair?

21 A. The businesses in the subsidiaries?

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. The vehicles themselves?

24 Q. Well, let me ask it this way. Those subsidiaries will
25 stop transacting new business, I take it?

1 A. If Barclays so chooses, yes, that's correct. In terms of
2 the process.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. We're still in a period, obviously, of working through the
5 dynamic of how the Barclays/Lehman integration, if it were to
6 happen, would take place.

7 Q. And along with the sale, what was referred to, I think at
8 the information session, as the infrastructure, which I take it
9 are the data processing and other items that enable the
10 businesses to work, that's being transferred over to Barclays?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. And that would apply -- and that's the same infrastructure
13 that enables the subsidiary's businesses to work, is that
14 correct?

15 A. Very different infrastructure, it's trading infrastructure
16 in particular. So trading platforms. The reason the data
17 centers are so important is the volume of electronic trading
18 taking place, for example, in equities. So it's a very
19 different infrastructure.

20 Q. Okay. Let me clarify that. Are you saying that the
21 infrastructure that's moving over to Barclays to cover all the
22 list of businesses that you agreed were being transferred, is
23 different than the infrastructure that helps run the
24 subsidiaries?

25 A. I'm sorry. There are different forms of infrastructure,

1 it's a broad term covering a lot of different aspects of
2 responsibilities for running these businesses.

3 Q. But the infrastructure for running all of the businesses
4 we went through at the outset is moving over to Barclays?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. At I think it's LH 745, the owner of the headquarter
7 building, who was that note payable to?

8 A. The intercompany?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. I don't know the specifics.

11 Q. Do you know whether the money will be -- do you know
12 whether that note payable will be satisfied at closing?

13 A. I believe it's already been -- I believe it was already
14 answered earlier that it was satisfied previously at this
15 point. I don't know specifically.

16 Q. There was lawyer's colloquy, but I just want to -- this is
17 the evidence part.

18 A. I do not know specifically.

19 Q. Okay. In running the businesses that we spoke about
20 earlier, would you agree that it's the employees that are
21 critically important?

22 A. Absolutely.

23 Q. When you negotiated this deal with Barclays, tell me, were
24 you at the table?

25 A. Absolutely.

1 Q. Okay. And who were you negotiating on behalf of?

2 A. I was negotiating on behalf of the estate.

3 Q. The estate of LBHI?

4 A. There were two phases of the negotiation. The weekend
5 conversations, which obviously did not transpire. And then
6 this phase of the negotiations.

7 Q. When you refer to estate, is it fair to say you meant
8 Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. --

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. -- and Lehman Brothers Inc., and Lehman Brothers 745?

11 A. Correct.

12 MR. BIENENSTOCK: No further questions, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Sabin, are you going to
14 question?

15 MR. SABIN: I do, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: What happened to that gentleman that
17 raised his hand and sat down --

18 MR. ROSNER: I'm sorry. I think Mr. Sabin was
19 prepared to go next. So if that's okay with Your Honor, it's
20 certainly okay --

21 THE COURT: It's perfectly fine. You just seemed
22 very interested to be the one who was going to take Mr.
23 Bienenstock's spot.

24 MR. ROSNER: No, it's just sometimes I'm hard to be
25 seen.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you'll be next if you want
2 to be.

3 MR. ROSNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. SABIN:

6 Q. Mr. McDade, good evening. I'll try to be brief. Are you
7 familiar with the conditions to closing of this proposed
8 transaction?

9 A. (No verbal response)

10 Q. And is it fair to say that one of those conditions require
11 a certain level of employees to be identified and to be
12 anticipated to go to becoming employed by Barclays?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. In your view as of today, is that condition satisfied or
15 capable of being satisfied?

16 A. That condition is still being worked through. You'd have
17 to speak to Barclays in terms of the specifics of their
18 satisfaction.

19 Q. Let's just assume for the moment that that condition could
20 be satisfied, are the employees who that condition speaks of
21 and identifies in any way, shape or form necessary to the
22 continued operation of any of the existing subsidiaries of LBI
23 today?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Lastly, Mr. McDade, there is a condition that was

1 negotiated that otherwise requires before Barclays funds, that
2 this Court had entered a final order with respect to certain
3 aspects of the sale. Has Barclays indicated to you that if
4 there were an appeal that they would close in the face of an
5 appeal if it were not safe?

6 A. I have not been part of that type of discussion.

7 MR. SABIN: I have no further questions. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Please state your name?

9 MR. ROSNER: Sure. Good evening, Your Honor. David
10 Rosner from Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman.

11 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, do we know who Mr. Rosner
12 represents?

13 THE COURT: He filed an objection which I saw and
14 read. But who do you represent?

15 MR. ROSNER: Apparently, Mr. Miller didn't get a
16 chance to read it.

17 THE COURT: He's been busier than I have been. I've
18 been preparing for this hearing and he's been doing other
19 things as well.

20 MR. ROSNER: Bay Harbour, there's four Bay Harbour
21 entities that are identified. And actually I just have a few
22 questions.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. ROSNER:

25 Q. At what point did Barclays express interest in any part of

1 Lehmans?

2 A. In any part of Lehman, the discussion started last Friday
3 evening.

4 Q. Did Barclay sign a confidentiality agreement?

5 A. Yes, it did.

6 Q. Did you see that confidentiality agreement?

7 A. No, I did not.

8 Q. Do you know when it was signed?

9 A. No, I do not. I assume Friday.

10 Q. Do you know if it was signed before they got access to any
11 information from Lehmans?

12 A. I do not know.

13 Q. When did they actually get access to Lehman confidential
14 information?

15 A. I do not know.

16 Q. You weren't involved in the process at all of providing
17 confidential information to --

18 A. When that process started I was negotiating with another
19 party.

20 Q. Do you know what Lehman did in -- I'm sorry, do you know
21 what Barclays did in terms of seeking information from Lehmans?

22 A. Do I know the specifics --

23 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, please, can we identify in
24 connection to what transaction?

25 MR. ROSNER: I'm sorry?

1 MR. MILLER: In connection with which transaction?

2 MR. ROSNER: In connection with the transaction that
3 we have here today.

4 THE COURT: Okay. It's an objection. The question
5 has been clarified. Is the objection withdrawn as a result of
6 that?

7 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.

8 MR. ROSNER: Okay.

9 Q. I'm sorry, was I not clear in the question? I want to be
10 clear, so if I'm not clear please feel free to interrupt.

11 A. I think it's important to note there were two sets of
12 discussions. The first over the weekend, organized
13 specifically on behalf of the markets and energized by the
14 Federal Reserve and other regulatory bodies. Those discussions
15 ended without a transaction, new discussions began the next
16 morning.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. The information used in both of those processes were
19 reasonably similar, obviously with any updates that might have
20 been appropriate.

21 Q. Got you. Was there an amendment to a confidentiality
22 agreement, or was there --

23 A. Again, I was not directly part of those conversations.

24 Q. Are you aware of anything that Barclays asked for from
25 Lehman that Lehman did not provide in terms of information in

1 order to make an assessment as to whether to go forward with a
2 transaction?

3 A. I'm not specifically aware of anything that they asked for
4 that we could not provide.

5 Q. Are you aware of whether they asked for or were given
6 information regarding intercompany transactions?

7 A. I'm not aware specifically.

8 Q. Does that include intercompany payables?

9 A. Again, not aware specifically.

10 Q. And intercompany receivables as well?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. Okay. Are you aware today if there's an intercompany
13 payable to what I'll call LB -- do you know what I mean by
14 LBIE?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Are you aware today whether there's an intercompany
17 payable to LBIE by either of the debtor entities?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. How much is it?

20 A. Approximately five billion.

21 Q. And where did that one arise?

22 A. I'm sorry?

23 Q. Where did that -- I'm sorry. Where did that intercompany
24 payable arise? From where did that intercompany payable arise?

25 A. I think it's a series of transactions. I'm not aware of

1 the specifics.

2 Q. Are you aware of any of the specifics?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Not a single one?

5 A. With respect to the intercompany?

6 Q. With respect to the intercompany payable from these
7 debtors to LBIE?

8 A. I know the notional amount.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. Five billion.

11 Q. Do you know if money was transferred from LBIE to the
12 debtor entities on Friday, the last week?

13 A. I'm not involved in the day-to-day process of financing
14 the firm.

15 Q. But my question was whether you were aware of that?

16 A. No, I'm not specifically aware.

17 Q. Have you read anything about that?

18 A. Absolutely.

19 Q. You have read something about that?

20 A. Have I read it in the media, is that what you're referring
21 to?

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And you did testify that you were at the meeting yesterday
25 at Weil Gotshal?

1 A. I was at an afternoon session. My understanding is there
2 was more than one session.

3 Q. And these questions were asked as to the intercompany
4 payable, correct?

5 A. Uh-huh.

6 Q. And do you recall whether --

7 THE COURT: You have to answer with more than a nod
8 of the head. Thanks.

9 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

10 Q. And do you recall whether this information that I'm asking
11 now was given yesterday at the information center?

12 A. It was not given yesterday.

13 Q. Which debtor entity owes that money to LBIE?

14 A. LBI is a payable to LBIE.

15 Q. And what about Holdings?

16 A. LBIE is a payable to LB Holdings.

17 Q. And how much is that?

18 A. Eight billion.

19 Q. And do you know what that's derived from?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Did you do an audit of the -- I'm sorry. Has an audit
22 been accomplished of the securities that are to be transferred
23 to Barclays under the proposed transactions?

24 A. If you mean an audit by external valuation process?

25 Q. By identification of the securities?

1 A. Absolutely, line by line.

2 Q. I think during your proffer it was stated that you are
3 familiar with the contract. I assume that means you don't know
4 every line but you are generally familiar with the contract
5 that's before the Court today, is that a fair statement?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Are you aware of the closing conditions under the
8 contract?

9 A. I believe so.

10 Q. Are they all satisfied as of today, subject to the entry
11 of an order by this Court?

12 A. With respect to all those that I have knowledge of, yes.

13 Q. And I think there was a question, but I just want to be
14 clear. There is a closing condition regarding eight employees
15 signing up agreements, is that correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. And I might have missed this before, and have all of those
18 eight employees been signed up?

19 A. We expect no issues with respect to the employment
20 services needs to close.

21 Q. Okay. So as of sitting here right now, that condition has
22 not been met?

23 A. We expect no issues.

24 Q. For the record, it's a yes or no and I just want to make
25 it clear on the record?

1 A. I do not have the specific information with respect to
2 either the exact number of those participants or with respect
3 to Barclays' view as to whether that would be waived if,
4 indeed, that became an issue.

5 MR. ROSNER: Okay. I have nothing further, Your
6 Honor. Thank you.

7 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else
8 that wishes to examine Mr. McDade? Come forward. Please state
9 your name and identity of the client that you're here to
10 represent.

11 MR. BYRNE: Yes, Your Honor, good afternoon. Larry
12 Byrne from Linklaters. Linklaters, Your Honor, represents the
13 administrators who have been appointed to supervise the
14 insolvency of four Lehman Brothers entities in the U.K. and in
15 Europe.

16 THE COURT: These are the Pricewaterhouse people?

17 MR. BYRNE: Yes, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. BYRNE: So we act for Pricewaterhouse who are now
20 the insolvency administrators in the U.K. for these four Lehman
21 Brothers entities who are affiliates of subsidiaries of the
22 debtors.

23 THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed with your
24 questions.

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. BYRNE:

2 Q. Good evening, Mr. McDade. The hour's late, so I have just
3 a few questions for you following up on the previous questions.

4 You referred to an intercompany payable in the amount of
5 five billion and an intercompany payable in the amount of eight
6 billion. Do you know when those payables first arose or came
7 into existence?

8 A. No, I do not.

9 Q. When did you first become aware of them?

10 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Your Honor. I'm not quite
11 sure I understand how that relates to whether the sale should
12 be approved or not. It seems to be the administrator in London
13 is trying to find out information concerning whether it has a
14 claim against this estate, what's going to happen to that
15 claim. It doesn't go to this transaction.

16 THE COURT: Well, let me observe that I have read a
17 number of objections that have raised questions concerning
18 whether this transaction, if approved, would affect the ability
19 of parties-in-interest, including the Pricewaterhouse foreign
20 representatives, I'll call them for these purposes, in being
21 able to pursue a claim for recovery in this estate of the eight
22 billion dollars that, according to the objection that I read,
23 was allegedly swept from LBIE on Friday, a week ago, to the
24 accounts of LBH. And that didn't come back to LBIE on Monday
25 presumably as a consequence of the bankruptcy filing. And so I

1 don't know that this goes to the reasonableness of the debtors'
2 business judgment in proposing that this transaction be
3 approved this evening, as much as it goes to the legal affect
4 of such approval in light of the ambiguities -- alleged
5 ambiguities and vagueness -- the alleged vagueness of the asset
6 purchase agreement and the various documents that have been
7 offered up to parties-in-interest.

8 So with that, I overrule your comment and will permit
9 the examination.

10 MR. BYRNE: Thank you, Your Honor. May I proceed?

11 THE COURT: Yes.

12 BY MR. BYRNE:

13 Q. When did you first become aware of these two intercompany
14 payables, the eight billion, the five billion, apart from press
15 reports?

16 A. I followed up post the session that we had yesterday to
17 make sure I had the information.

18 Q. And what information did you learn as a result of that
19 follow-up?

20 A. The previous statements that I made with respect to the
21 nominal amounts.

22 Q. I'm not sure I understand what you're saying.

23 A. LBI has a payable to LBIE. LBIE has a payable to LBH.
24 Those are the figures and data that I researched.

25 Q. And following up to confirm those figures and data, what

1 is it that you looked at?

2 A. I looked at a summary finance document from one of our
3 senior finance officers.

4 Q. That's an internal document at Lehman?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And who is the senior finance officer that had prepared
7 that?

8 A. I don't know who prepared the document. The interaction I
9 had was with a gentleman named Chris O'Meara.

10 Q. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

11 A. Chris O'Meara.

12 MR. BYRNE: Your Honor, I don't think I have any
13 further questions at this time. I would like an opportunity
14 either now or later just to clarify a couple of things you said
15 with respect to the PWC administrator's position. Because
16 they're actually not objecting to this transaction.

17 THE COURT: Oh, great. I assumed because you were
18 asking questions that you were getting in the way of it.

19 MR. BYRNE: No, not at all, Your Honor, we just
20 wanted clarification based on the questions that were asked
21 earlier. You may not have seen, because it did not get
22 electronically filed until shortly before the hearing, what the
23 administrators have filed, which is a response to the proposed
24 settlement, not an objection. And we say in the first line of
25 that response that the administrators have no objections to the

1 approval of this transaction this evening.

2 There are some clarifications we're going to seek,
3 but we can do that later in the proceeding with the Court's
4 permission.

5 THE COURT: Fine. The only thing I read was the
6 declaration that was filed. In order to triage the preparation
7 for this hearing, I read things that I thought would be
8 helpful.

9 MR. BYRNE: Right. We have a declaration from the
10 PWC administrator --

11 THE COURT: That's what I read.

12 MR. BYRNE: Okay. I think the transaction details
13 you're describing might have been in someone else's objection,
14 not in ours.

15 THE COURT: If I misstated the facts it's because I
16 didn't understand --

17 MR. BYRNE: Understood, Your Honor. I have nothing
18 further at this time, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anyone else that would --
20 Ms. Granfield?

21 MS. GRANFIELD: Good evening, Your Honor. Lindsay
22 Granfield, Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton, LLP on behalf of
23 Barclays Capital.

24 Odd procedural posture. I think that there's going
25 to be very able -- probably not too long an able redirect by

1 the debtor. And that might make it unnecessary for me to ask
2 any questions. And, in fact, if there was a short recess, I
3 might be able to confer with Mr. Miller on what he planned to
4 cover and not make it necessary for me to ask any questions.

5 THE COURT: Well, before taking that welcomed recess,
6 because I think people are probably ready for one, let me just
7 confirm that there is no one else, other than yourself, at this
8 moment, has an interest in asking any further questions of Mr.
9 McDade?

10 MS. GRANFIELD: Very good, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: I see no one moving in the direction of
12 the podium, and I see no one indicating an interest in asking
13 questions. So I'm going to assume that you are the last
14 possible questioner on cross. And since its now about ten
15 minutes to 8 in the evening and it is warm, and many people are
16 standing, I'm going to propose that we take a break until 8:15.
17 And we'll resume at that time.

18 MS. GRANFIELD: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 (Recess from 7:48 p.m. until 8:45 p.m.)

20 THE COURT: Be seated, please.

21 MR. MILLER: Once again, good evening, Your Honor.
22 Harvey Miller for the debtors.

23 Your Honor, in the interest of expedition, I would
24 offer into evidence the asset purchase agreement among Lehman
25 Brothers Holdings Inc., Lehman Brothers Inc., LB 745 LLC and

1 Barclays Capital, Inc. dated as of September 16, 2008 and the
2 first amendment to the asset purchase agreement among the same
3 parties, Your Honor, dated September 19, 2008.

4 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the admission
5 of the evidence of those two documents?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. No, I haven't seen it.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We haven't been given a copy
8 even.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Same, Your Honor.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor, we would have the
11 additional objection of it's unclear whether this even
12 represents the final asset purchase agreement or whether terms
13 are made to be negotiated.

14 THE COURT: I don't think it needs to represent the
15 final. It's a document that -- assuming the first one is a
16 document everybody's seen, the second one is the only document
17 that may be subject to reasonable objection. And whether or
18 not it is, in fact, the document that would govern the closing
19 is irrelevant to its admissibility. That objection is
20 overruled.

21 As far as the amendment, I'm certainly interested in
22 seeing it. I'm sure others are as well. How many copies are
23 there? Or are there copies?

24 MR. MILLER: As I said last time, Your Honor, modern
25 technology is not what it's all cracked up to be. Your Honor,

1 I have --

2 THE COURT: I would also note that copies of a
3 document, while a courtesy of counsel, are not a condition to
4 admissibility. And if an offer of proof is made as to the
5 authenticity of the document, the fact that it is what it
6 purports to be, which is the second amendment, I'm prepared to
7 admit it notwithstanding the fact that copies are not
8 available, recognizing that there is an objection that is a
9 reasonable one that all other parties to the transaction need
10 to see a copy at some point so they have reasonable notice.

11 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I would make an offer of
12 proof that this is a document. This represents the asset
13 purchase agreement that's dated as of September 16, 2008, which
14 was attached or filed at 6 a.m., or whatever it was, in the
15 morning, a couple of days ago with a lot of interlineations.
16 This is a clean draft -- a clean copy, Your Honor. This is the
17 execution -- a copy of the execution copy.

18 THE COURT: It is the hand-marked copy typed so that
19 the edits that we saw in handwriting are now incorporated in
20 full font?

21 MR. MILLER: That is correct, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. MILLER: I would represent, Your Honor, that the
24 first amendment to the asset purchase agreement, which consists
25 of exactly four pages, dated September 19 -- and this is a copy

1 of the execution copy of that document, Your Honor, which
2 clarifies certain provisions in the asset purchase agreement,
3 and, Your Honor, is part of -- an integral part of the
4 agreement and is signed on behalf of Lehman Brothers Holdings,
5 Lehman Brothers Inc., LB 745 and Barclays Capital.

6 THE COURT: May I simply ask if the witness who's on
7 the witness stand is familiar with that document or had
8 anything to do with its execution, it might be in a position to
9 further authenticate it?

10 MR. MILLER: May I approach, Your Honor?

11 THE COURT: Yes.

12 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. MILLER:

14 Q. Mr. McDade, are you familiar with the fact that a first
15 amendment was made to the asset purchase agreement?

16 A. Yes, I am.

17 Q. The document which I have shown you, have you seen that
18 document before?

19 A. Yes, I have.

20 Q. Are you familiar with that document?

21 A. Yes, I am.

22 Q. Is that the first amendment to the asset purchase
23 agreement?

24 A. Yes, it is.

25 Q. That was executed on behalf of the debtors?

1 **A. Yes.**

2 MR. MILLER: I offer it, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Notwithstanding the objection that copies
4 are not available, it's admitted. So it's in evidence along
5 with that first one.

6 (Copy of execution copy of asset purchase agreement among LBHI,
7 LBI, LB 745 LLC and Barclays Capital, Inc. dated 9/16/08 and
8 first amendment thereto dated 9/19/08 were hereby received as
9 Debtor's Exhibit into evidence, as of this date.)

10 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. If I might, Your
11 Honor, I would like to hand up copies to you on -- so that'd be
12 marked, Your Honor?

13 THE COURT: If you wish to have them marked they can
14 be marked. Thank you.

15 BY MR. MILLER:

16 **Q. Mr. McDade, in your cross-examination concerning LBIE, you**
17 **made reference to the notional value of the payables and the**
18 **receivable. What did you mean by "notional value"?**

19 **A. The -- the notional of eight billion was the -- the**
20 **figure, the gross figure at the bottom of the calculation.**

21 **Q. Does the transaction contemplate a transition services**
22 **agreement?**

23 **A. Yes, it does.**

24 **Q. And what would that agreement provide?**

25 **A. Those would provide services to Barclays and back with**

1 respect to all of the associated business responsibilities that
2 would be necessary to continue the business as it moves on --
3 the businesses as they move on.

4 Q. And is that agreement in the process of being negotiated
5 right now?

6 A. Yes, it is.

7 Q. Have you formed an opinion as to whether that will come to
8 fruition?

9 A. Yes, I did.

10 Q. And what is your opinion?

11 A. Yes, it will.

12 MR. MILLER: I have no further questions of this
13 witness, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Given that very limited redirect, I would
15 hope that further examination would be held to a limited period
16 given the hour. But I don't wish to restrict the examination
17 of any party-in-interest who wishes to further examine only
18 with respect to the subject of the redirect.

19 I see no interest in further questioning. I believe
20 it's now timely to excuse the witness. Mr. McDade, thank you.
21 You're excused.

22 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I am pleased to announce
24 that we have reached agreement in respect of the value of the
25 real estate. As Your Honor may recall, there was a difference

1 of opinion between Barclays and Lehman. The Barclays
2 appraisal, Your Honor, which I referred to, that was made by CB
3 Richard Ellis, was an appraisal for the building and states
4 specifically in the appraisal, Your Honor, the appraisal
5 premise is as is, assuming market tenant in place.

6 I told Your Honor if there is no tenant in place the
7 value of the buildings really depreciates. That appraisal,
8 Your Honor, was one billion twenty million dollars. Barclays
9 obtained an appraisal for the building at 900 million dollars,
10 Your Honor. The parties have agreed to split the difference.
11 That's so that the value that would go to the estate, Your
12 Honor, is 960 million dollars.

13 As to the two data centers, Your Honor, Barclays has
14 agreed that the appraisal values obtained by Lehman for those
15 two properties, which total 330 thousand dollars --

16 THE COURT: Three hundred thirty million, perhaps?

17 MR. MILLER: Three hundred thirty million dollars,
18 Your Honor. It's getting late. So that there would be a
19 billion 290 -- I'm sorry, a billion 290 million dollars as the
20 purchase price, and there will be no brokers' commissions, Your
21 Honor. So that will be the amount received if this
22 transaction's consummated.

23 THE COURT: All right. So, notwithstanding some of
24 the things that came up during the opening remarks and the
25 examination of the witness, there is, at this moment, a

1 stipulation which you have put on the record that the real
2 estate component of the transaction, in the aggregate, and I
3 just want to be sure, that the number will be valued at one
4 billion 290 million dollars and there will be no commission
5 payable.

6 MR. MILLER: That is correct, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Fine. Thank you.

8 MR. MILLER: Okay. Your Honor, just one observation.
9 We told Your Honor that if this transaction were to be approved
10 in a relatively short period of time that, if we can, we could
11 transfer the accounts before 10:45 p.m.

12 THE COURT: Let's get to work.

13 MR. MILLER: Okay. Your Honor, our next witness
14 would be Mr. Barry W. Ridings of Lazard. And I would also,
15 Your Honor, do a fast proffer.

16 THE COURT: Is there any objection to proceeding by
17 means of a proffer with respect to Mr. Ridings' direct
18 examination?

19 There's no objection. Please proceed.

20 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, if Mr. Ridings were called
21 to testify in support of the sale motion, his direct testimony
22 would be as follows:

23 Mr. Ridings joined Lazard in July 1999; is co-head of
24 the restructuring group. He has a BA from Colgate University
25 and an MBA in finance from Cornell University.

1 From 1990 to 1999, Mr. Ridings was the managing
2 director of BT Alex. Brown and this restructuring group.

3 Before that, Mr. Ridings served as a managing
4 director in the restructuring group at Drexel Burnham and
5 Lambert. Interesting. As a result of his experiences --

6 THE COURT: At least we have somebody to point the
7 finger at.

8 MR. MILLER: As a result of the experiences at
9 Drexel, Mr. Ridings knows of the consequences of failure of a
10 major investment bank and the costs in dislocation that occur.

11 Since 1990, Lazard's professionals have been involved
12 in over 250 restructurings, representing 350 billion dollars in
13 debtors' assets.

14 Mr. Ridings is the head of Lazard's capital markets
15 group, which is the Lazard unit responsible for equity and bond
16 sales, trading and research business, which is the same
17 business being sold by LBI to Barclays.

18 Mr. Ridings has testified in many reorganization
19 cases, including Macy's, Western Union, Owens Corning, Marble
20 Entertainment, Fruit of the Loom, Sun Healthcare, Wang
21 Laboratories and Vlastic Foods.

22 He is also a former member of the board of directors
23 of the American Stock Exchange and serves on corporate boards,
24 including New Valley Corp. and other corporations.

25 Mr. Ridings has been the principal investment banker

1 on over twenty-five public offerings of high-yield debt. He
2 also has extensive experience with IPOs, opinion letters and
3 M&A transactions.

4 Lehman retained Lazard and Mr. Ridings to offer
5 investment banking and financial advice. Mr. Ridings' work in
6 this matter also involved assisting in the sale of the various
7 assets.

8 He was intimately involved in the negotiations
9 between Lehman and Barclays that resulted in the asset purchase
10 agreement. He would testify that he has become reasonably
11 familiar with Lehman's business and has reviewed the terms and
12 provisions of the asset purchase agreement with Barclays.

13 Mr. Ridings would testify that over the past year the
14 financial markets have been extremely volatile with negative
15 consequences to Lehman and other similar firms.

16 He would testify that Lehman has faced a continued
17 lack of liquidity in the credit markets, significantly
18 depressed volumes in most equity markets, a widening in fixed
19 income credit spreads compared to the end of 2007 fiscal year
20 as well as declining asset values. As a leading firm in the
21 financial markets, these factors have had a materially negative
22 impact on Lehman.

23 He would testify that there was downward pressure on
24 financial asset prices, and Lehman's inventory positions
25 diminished in value and its liquidity began to contract.

1 In addition, Lehman's transactional volumes and
2 market activity for Lehman's capital markets and investment
3 banking business segments also contracted.

4 Lehman's portfolio was particularly vulnerable
5 because it held significant volumes of illiquid residential
6 mortgages and structured credit products.

7 At the time of Lazard's engagement, he was aware that
8 Lehman's management was exploring several different options to
9 deal with the crisis. Specifically, he is aware that Lehman
10 explored selling its investment management division to raise
11 much needed liquidity, and it also considered spinning off some
12 of its illiquid real estate assets.

13 Before any of these strategic maneuvers came to
14 fruition, the company was forced to file the Chapter 11 cases
15 because its assets were rapidly depreciating and they could not
16 raise additional liquidity.

17 Mr. Ridings would also testify that the sale of LBI
18 must be immediately consummated or there will be little or
19 nothing to sell.

20 There are few potential purchasers for this business
21 because any buyer must meet regulatory requirements, have
22 sufficient capital and have the strategic capability to operate
23 the business from day one.

24 He would testify that he and other members of the
25 Lazard team were involved in the discussions and negotiations

1 with Barclays.

2 Mr. Ridings would testify that the negotiations were
3 at arm's length, difficult and aggressively negotiated by the
4 parties, that the asset purchase agreement is the result of
5 good faith negotiations.

6 He would testify that the parties worked around the
7 clock to finalize the purchase agreement because they realize
8 that time was of the essence and that the business would not
9 survive without an immediate infusion of new liquidity.

10 Between Monday and Wednesday of this week, he would
11 testify the parties exchanged numerous bids and asks and turned
12 drafts of the agreement countless times.

13 He would also testify that since executing the asset
14 purchase agreement the parties have continued to work nonstop
15 in order to prepare for closing, contracts have been identified
16 for assumption or assignment and, with the authority from the
17 Court, debtor-in-possession financing was obtained for LBHI.

18 He would testify that these assets have substantially
19 greater value if they are sold as a going concern. Despite the
20 tremendous publicity associated with this case, not one firm,
21 other than Barclays, showed up with an interest in the assets
22 as a whole. Without Barclays, Lehman would be forced to sell
23 discreet assets for a fraction of the value that will be
24 realized from this transaction.

25 By selling the business as a going concern, Lehman

1 has preserved approximately nine to ten thousand jobs for its
2 employees and avoided significant costs and claims that would
3 have resulted if there were mass layoffs and a cessation of
4 operations.

5 He would also testify that calls were placed to a
6 number of prospective bidders over this week. He would testify
7 that Lehman's situation was widely known in the financial
8 services industry and yet no one really appeared to show an
9 interest.

10 He will testify that Lazard had twenty-one contacts
11 with entities that expressed an interest but not one of them,
12 nor any other entity, had expressed the desire or ability to
13 step into Barclays' shoes.

14 Practically, he would testify there were few
15 potential purchasers for these assets. Of this universe, most
16 of the funds that could purchase these assets have their own
17 cash flow problems to contend with and are not looking to
18 expand.

19 Any prospective purchaser would need access to the
20 Federal Reserve Funds to operate Lehman's business. The list
21 of firms authorized to trade directly with the Federal Reserve
22 System and borrow from the so-called "window" is limited. Each
23 entity must meet stringent capital and regulatory requirements.

24 He would testify that, in his opinion, Barclays'
25 offer is the highest and best offer for these assets.

1 Lehman is selling its North American investment
2 banking and capital markets business. This business focuses on
3 fixed income, equities, trading, advisory services, futures and
4 investment banking. The costs to Lehman and counterparties, as
5 pending transactions unwind, if this transaction is not
6 approved, will run into the many billions of dollars.
7 Counterparties will be required to liquidate their collateral
8 positions, which may entail a wholesale dumping of the
9 collateral into the marketplace with the attendant erosion of
10 values. The deficiencies that counterparties may incur will
11 result in massive claims against the assets of the Lehman
12 estates. Ten to twelve thousand employees may not find any
13 employment. Any failure to consummate may potentially cause a
14 major shock to the financial system.

15 Although the potential sale of Lehman assets has
16 generally been known to the financial community for many months
17 and that the current transaction has gotten enormous and wide
18 media attention, as previously stated, only twenty very limited
19 inquiries were made from outside parties.

20 Again, he would testify, Your Honor, the universe of
21 potentially qualified and capable purchases is extremely
22 limited by the huge financial commitment that would have to be
23 made and the ability to access federal funds. At most, there
24 are less than a half dozen possible entities that might
25 qualify, and most of them have their own financial needs.

1 In conclusion, it is Mr. Ridings' opinion, he would
2 testify, that this sale transaction should be approved because
3 it serves the best interests of the creditors, the public and
4 the nation and that it was negotiated in good faith and at
5 arm's length by both parties.

6 That concludes the proffer, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Is there anyone who objects to my receipt
8 of the proffer in evidence or who wishes to examine Mr. Ridings
9 on cross-examination?

10 MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, again, Abid Qureshi, Akin
11 Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, on behalf of the informal committee
12 of note holders -- the informal group of note holders. We
13 would like to cross-examine Mr. Ridings briefly.

14 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Ridings, would you please
15 come to the stand? Mr. Ridings, please, before sitting down,
16 just raise your right hand. I'm going to swear you as a
17 witness.

18 (Witness duly sworn)

19 THE COURT: Please be seated.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. QURESHI:

22 Q. Good evening, Mr. Ridings. Sir, when was Lazard first
23 retained in connection with this engagement?

24 A. Lazard had been working with Lehman since July. We had an
25 engagement letter signed last Friday, before the filing, in

1 connection with the transactions that did not happen. And then
2 we were re-retained on, I guess, Monday afternoon, after the
3 filing.

4 Q. Okay. And, sir, is it correct that you are, again,
5 generally familiar with the terms and the provisions contained
6 in the asset purchase agreement?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And in your proffer the preservation of nine to ten
9 thousand jobs was discussed, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And is it your understanding that Barclays' obligation,
12 under the terms of the asset purchase agreement, is to only
13 keep those employees for ninety days?

14 A. I think, under the terms of the agreement, all nine to ten
15 thousand people will be offered a job for ninety days, and at
16 the end of that period Barclays will decide if they want to
17 offer them full-time employment or not and, if not, they will
18 be given severance according to Lehman's normal severance
19 policy.

20 Q. Okay. With the severance to be paid by whom?

21 A. Barclays.

22 Q. Okay. So the obligation to employ runs only for ninety
23 days?

24 A. I don't know that there's a commitment only for ninety
25 days. It's unimaginable to me that they can run the business

1 without people.

2 Q. Sir, are you generally familiar with the closing
3 conditions contained in the APA?

4 A. Generally.

5 Q. Okay. And, according to your understanding, as you sit
6 here today, have all of the closing conditions been satisfied?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any specific closing conditions
9 that have not been satisfied?

10 A. I don't know.

11 Q. Okay. Are you aware, sir, of the provision in the asset
12 purchase agreement that requires contracts to be negotiated
13 with eight key employees?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Is it your understanding that that is a closing condition?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Is it your understanding that that closing condition has
18 been satisfied?

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that that closing
21 condition has been waived by Barclays?

22 A. Not that I know of.

23 Q. Okay. Sir, is it also your understanding that one of the
24 closing conditions is that, I believe, a prior version of the
25 APA used the term "substantial majority" of so-called "critical

1 employees" agreed to go with Barclays upon the closing of the
2 transaction?

3 A. My understanding: that it's that they don't leave. I
4 don't know that there's an agreement that they go.

5 Q. That they are acquired by Barclays, in other words?

6 A. In other words, they haven't left before the closing.

7 Q. Right. And is it your understanding --

8 MR. QURESHI: Or, strike that.

9 Q. Do you know if that closing condition has been complied
10 with?

11 A. We're closing tonight or we're not closing?

12 Q. Do you have an understanding of whether the substantial
13 majority of the employees on that list have agreed to stay upon
14 the closing?

15 A. That's not the -- they don't leave. It's not that they
16 agreed to stay. And at close of business I saw people working,
17 albeit not everybody was at their desk.

18 Q. Sir, in your proffer -- through your proffer you testified
19 that Lazard has contacted a number of entities in connection
20 with attempting to find buyers for these assets. Is that
21 correct?

22 A. Can you clarify when?

23 Q. Well, that is going to be my question. Since the
24 transaction with Barclays was signed up, has any effort been
25 made by Lazard to try to find an alternative buyer for the same

1 assets being acquired by Barclays?

2 A. Okay. There's a two-part answer: Number one, we
3 responded to inquiries coming in in the form of phone calls,
4 fax and letters. We spoke with all of those people. And as
5 mentioned in the proffer, not one of those people offered to
6 buy the assets that Barclays is buying. Those inquiries ranged
7 from someone who wanted to buy the phone system to people who
8 wanted usually to buy real estate.

9 In terms of reaching out to other parties, as Mr. Miller
10 suggested, there's a very limited number of people who would be
11 qualified. Almost every single one of those limited people
12 have either just completed an acquisition or are in the midst
13 of an acquisition or a merger.

14 It was my belief that it would not serve a purpose for me
15 or Lazard to reach out to those parties and say would you like
16 to bid for fear of throwing more panic on this offering.

17 Based on what's been reported in the papers, if those
18 people were interested they would have called.

19 Q. So am I to understand, sir, that your testimony is then
20 that Lazard, on behalf of the company, made no affirmative
21 effort to reach out to potential buyers for these assets but
22 responded only to inquiries that were received?

23 A. Based on what I said, yes.

24 Q. Okay. And, sir, in terms of the inquiries that were
25 received, were those people that inquired told that subsets of

1 the assets being acquired by Barclays were available? Or were
2 those people told that they would only be considered if they
3 wanted to buy everything?

4 A. The latter.

5 Q. Okay. And why is that, sir?

6 A. Because Barclays wasn't willing to close if they could --
7 people could cherry-pick assets.

8 Q. Okay. So do you know, for example, if any offers were
9 received through inquiries coming in to Lazard for the real
10 estate assets that exceed what Barclays is prepared to pay for
11 the real estate assets?

12 A. The real estate inquiries we got are for things that we
13 call CRE, commercial real estate, and they are not the assets
14 that are being sold to Barclays.

15 Q. So your testimony is that none of the inquiries that
16 Lazard received for any of the assets going to Barclays were
17 specific offers with respect to the same real estate being
18 acquired by Barclays?

19 A. Well, my understanding was that the inquiries for the real
20 estate were for the commercial real estate, not the securities
21 that Barclays is buying. Yes, that's my understanding.

22 Q. Sir, I'd like to ask you a question about the amendment to
23 the purchase agreement that we just received. If Mr. Miller
24 has a copy that I could hand up to the witness, that would
25 help.

1 MR. MILLER: Here.

2 MR. QURESHI: Thank you. May I approach, Your Honor?

3 THE COURT: You may.

4 Q. Mr. Ridings, first, were you involved in the negotiations
5 concerning this amendment?

6 A. Concerning the amendment, generally. The words on the
7 page, no.

8 Q. Okay. Let me direct your attention to paragraph 4.
9 That's the holdback and adjustment provision. And, again, my
10 apologies; I barely had time to read it. Can you please
11 explain, if you can, what your understanding is of that
12 provision and how it's to work?

13 A. I haven't read this either, so I can't explain it.

14 Q. So you were not involved in the negotiation of that
15 particular provision?

16 A. Not of that paragraph.

17 Q. Okay.

18 MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, may I have a brief moment?

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 Q. Sir, is it your understanding that Barclays is now
21 demanding the holdback of 250 million dollars subject to
22 certain offsets?

23 A. I mean, the paragraph says what it says. And I can read
24 it for you, if you'd like.

25 Q. No, that's okay.

1 A. Okay.

2 Q. Sir, in your negotiations with Barclays, right, related to
3 this amendment, did they make the demand to you that they
4 wanted the holdback of 250 million dollars?

5 A. They did not make that demand to me, no.

6 Q. Okay. Are you aware of that demand having been made --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- in the negotiations? Are you aware of Lehman having
9 agreed to it?

10 A. I believe they've agreed to this.

11 Q. Thank you.

12 MR. QURESHI: Nothing further.

13 THE COURT: Is there anyone else who wishes to cross-
14 examine Mr. Ridings?

15 Is there any redirect?

16 MR. MILLER: Just one question, Your Honor.

17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. MILLER:

19 Q. Mr. Ridings, you're aware of the additional amendments
20 that have been made to the asset purchase agreement which were
21 discussed earlier today?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And isn't it a fact that under those additional amendments
24 and clarifications that the 250 million dollars, to the
25 goodwill of LBI, is going to be paid to LBI?

1 A. That's my understanding. Yes, sir.

2 Q. So that that holdback provision has since been amended,
3 and in the clarified agreement there will be 250 million
4 dollars, if this transaction is consummated, that will go to
5 LBI?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Ridings, you're excused. Thank you.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

10 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Your Honor, I have one
11 clarification on the record. We had submitted -- it doesn't
12 affect your BNC. We had submitted, I think as Your Honor might
13 have noted, two responses to the pending motion. When I cross-
14 examined, I only cross-examined on behalf of the Walt Disney
15 Company because, based on clarifications given to the Royal
16 Bank of Scotland, they are satisfied and withdraw their
17 response.

18 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Miller, do you have any
19 more witnesses?

20 MR. MILLER: No, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: We're relieved. Does that conclude the
22 evidentiary portion of your case?

23 MR. MILLER: Concludes the debtors' case, Your Honor.
24 I assume my friend, Mr. Sabin, has to have the last word.

25 MR. SABIN: Not the last. I'm just asking whether,

1 on the record, we can include the debtors' affirmative case
2 with a clarification that was still left open, and that was as
3 to whether master ISDA agreements and master securities
4 contracts, other than those owned by Barclays, will not be sold
5 as part of this transaction.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. They will not.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

8 MR. SABIN: Thank you.

9 THE COURT: Okay. We've got clarification, which I
10 don't treat as part of the evidentiary record but rather as
11 stipulation of counsel or a response to counsel's question.

12 I'll repeat my question to Mr. Miller: Do you have
13 any other evidence that you wish to offer?

14 MR. MILLER: No, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Fine. Then the debtors' case, at least
16 evidentiary case, in support of the proposed relief is
17 concluded.

18 I'll simply ask if any of the objectors are intending
19 to submit any evidence of their own in opposition to the
20 pending motion.

21 Someone on the phone is rustling papers that we are
22 all hearing, and you are disturbing hundreds of people. Stop
23 it, please. And if there's anyone on the telephone who doesn't
24 have their mute button pushed to mute, do so now.

25 Mr. Golden, do you have something you want to say?

1 MR. GOLDEN: No, I was just going to say that we did
2 not intend to call a witness, Your Honor. We do not intend to
3 call a witness.

4 THE COURT: I assume because nobody spoke that that
5 was the -- but now we know, and I'm even happier to know that
6 you do not intend to call witnesses.

7 It seems to me that, at this point, then, this comes
8 down to either arguments in support of those objections that
9 have not been either withdrawn, as in the case of Mr.
10 Bienenstock's other client, or deferred, as in the case of any
11 disputes with respect to cure amounts.

12 And so I'm going to ask, so we can do this
13 expeditiously, who wishes to press argument? Unless Mr.
14 Miller, as proponent of the transaction, wishes to say anything
15 before he hears the objectors.

16 MR. MILLER: No, Your Honor. I think time is of the
17 essence right now. I would just like to say, Your Honor, that
18 because time is of the essence I've been informed by Ms.
19 Bambach of the SEC that the regulators strongly support this
20 transaction.

21 THE COURT: I will incorporate into the record of
22 this proceeding statements made by counsel for the various
23 regulators on Wednesday at the time of bid procedures being
24 approved in which I heard and considered the various statements
25 of counsel for the regulators in support of the transaction.

1 MR. MILLER: I would just add to that, Your Honor,
2 when Mr. Gallagher spoke he said he didn't really have
3 authority from the commission. But since that time, the SEC --
4 I mean, the commission has met, and he's been duly authorized
5 and has the same position, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: That's good to hear. Thank you. Mr.
7 Despina?

8 MR. DESPINA: Your Honor, may I be heard very
9 briefly? And I apologize for this but we're moving really
10 quickly. And the first amendment -- Your Honor, we received
11 that about an hour ago, and there may be an issue here. And I
12 apologize but we just got it an hour ago. And, basically, this
13 is an amendment that protects DTC against potential claims that
14 may be made, and they're given collateral. I'm told that that
15 collateral could be as much as six billion dollars.

16 And that's fine, Your Honor. We're okay with that.
17 But the way this is drafted, they can keep this collateral
18 until all guaranteed obligations have been satisfied,
19 literally, one dollar left, they can keep six billion. I'm
20 exaggerating but that's the way -- I raised this with counsel
21 for DTC saying why don't we put in a provision in saying that
22 the Court, Your Honor, retains jurisdiction to make sure that
23 that situation does not present itself? And I don't believe
24 that they're agreeable to that. It puts us in a bizarre
25 position where -- we did not know about this provision. I

1 don't think it's intended that way but the way it's drafted
2 they can hold six billion if there's a hundred thousand dollars
3 of potential claims. We're not asking them to concede the
4 point. We're asking them to make that subject to Your Honor's
5 jurisdiction and further order.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Hirshon, do you want to comment with
7 respect to that? If you don't want to be here I can understand
8 why, but where do you want to be?

9 MR. HIRSHON: Right here, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. HIRSHON: I'm having a good time. Your Honor,
12 let me explain the situation because it's not quite right, what
13 you've heard. It is true that the first amendment, as a
14 contractual term, between the purchaser and the seller calls
15 for an amendment under which instead of fifty percent of the
16 residential mortgages a hundred percent of the residential
17 mortgages are being sold to the purchaser. There is a separate
18 agreement between the purchaser and DTC under which those
19 mortgages are going to be used as collateral for the clearing
20 corporations. So the collateral arrangements are part of the
21 APA, and they're not subject to the APA and not subject,
22 practically, to Your Honor's control.

23 So in order to make that possible, the APA had to be
24 amended so that the other half of the residential mortgages are
25 now owned by -- will be owned by the purchaser and therefore

1 pledged.

2 However, in order -- the parties themselves then
3 said, well, we want to restore where we were before where you
4 had fifty percent and fifty percent. So the APA then has in
5 its amendment that, after the guaranteed obligations are
6 satisfied, if there is anything left over, and as I said
7 before, it's expected that there will be, then the purchaser
8 will return the fifty percent to the seller. And that's what
9 the APA says.

10 So it's in two pieces. The APA itself is simply a --
11 is amended simply to transfer the one-half that wasn't being
12 originally acquired to the purchaser. There's a separate
13 arrangement between DTC and the purchaser. And the APA then
14 says and when you're done settling, if there's anything left,
15 the purchaser has an obligation to return the fifty percent.

16 Now, this was --

17 THE COURT: May I understand something, and I
18 apologize if I'm intruding on your argument, just to clarify
19 something?

20 MR. HIRSHON: Please.

21 THE COURT: Who's the custodian of this? Isn't it
22 DTC?

23 MR. HIRSHON: It is. That's where all these reside.

24 THE COURT: So aren't we just talking about
25 accounting entries?

1 MR. HIRSHON: Yes, we are.

2 THE COURT: The mortgages aren't moving?

3 MR. HIRSHON: They are not.

4 THE COURT: And you hold these as a fiduciary for
5 whoever has an interest in them?

6 MR. HIRSHON: Exactly. Mr. Despins, doesn't that
7 cure the problem? Or what is the problem? It's not as if
8 there's any risk that the assets are going to move.

9 MR. DESPINS: No, no. I'm not concerned that they're
10 going to dissipate the assets; that's not the concern at all.
11 I'm telling you my experience with depository companies, not
12 this one, of course, but others, is that --

13 THE COURT: This sounds like a swipe at other
14 companies to me, but go ahead.

15 MR. DESPINS: Yeah, is that they are not incentivized
16 to release collateral. And, in fact, they will hold it four
17 years unless there's a clear way to force them to release the
18 collateral. We don't want the estate to be in a position where
19 we're waiting for two or three years to receive potentially six
20 billion dollars back, or a portion of six billion dollars back.
21 That's my only concern.

22 They should be protected. I want to be clear about
23 that. I am not saying they shouldn't be protected. I'm saying
24 that Your Honor should be able to intervene in case of -- in
25 the event that something is not returned because it is a

1 hundred thousand dollars of unsatisfied obligations. They're
2 holding three billion. If that's not the case, we won't be
3 here. We won't be here. But we --

4 THE COURT: Well, I --

5 MR. DESPINS: -- we don't want to be without
6 recourse. That's all.

7 THE COURT: -- I understand the point, although --
8 and I don't diminish the point by saying that it seems a highly
9 theoretical one to be pressing at this point in the hearing,
10 given that the estate's interest, whatever it may be, is, I'll
11 use the term, adequately protected, but I do understand this to
12 be an issue of whether or not DTC will, this evening, consent
13 to jurisdiction here for purposes of, in effect, being forced
14 to make an accounting entry for the benefit of the estate when
15 they are disproportionately oversecured by a gargantuan pool of
16 mortgages in respect of a de minimis claim.

17 My sense is that if they are in that position and are
18 resistant, that they would find themselves at the wrong end of
19 some litigation somewhere.

20 MR. DESPINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: And I don't know that this is a
22 particularly good time to force the issue, but I hear your
23 argument and I understand that you're looking to have DTC blink
24 on it. And I don't know if they're willing to do that this
25 evening.

1 MR. DESPINS: No, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Okay. So --

3 MR. DESPINS: But is it clear that Your Honor will
4 have -- will retain jurisdiction over that issue?

5 THE COURT: Well, it's not clear at all if we're
6 talking about nondebtors arguing about relative rights in
7 collateral posted to secured DTC's claims.

8 So I think that whatever I said tonight wouldn't
9 create jurisdiction, and I'm not prepared to reach that
10 question now. If the parties are willing to stipulate to
11 jurisdiction, I'm not even sure that solves the problem. There
12 either is or there isn't jurisdiction.

13 MR. DESPINS: And I'm not authorized to stipulate --

14 THE COURT: Fine.

15 MR. DESPINS: -- to jurisdiction.

16 THE COURT: So I think at this point the argument --
17 I understand the argument. We have a record on it. I trust
18 that DTC will not act in a commercially unreasonable manner and
19 that, whether or not this Court has jurisdiction, there are
20 clearly courts of competent jurisdiction in a position to
21 adjudicate future disputes.

22 MR. DESPINS: Thank you, Your Honor. And, Your
23 Honor, just to be clear, we would have raised this a long time
24 ago if we had seen the provision. We apologize but we just saw
25 it an hour ago. Thank you.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Now what?

2 MR. GOLDEN: Is it time for the objections, Your
3 Honor?

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. GOLDEN: Thank you. Daniel Golden, Akin Gump
6 Strauss Hauer & Feld, on behalf of an ad hoc group of LBHI
7 senior, sub and junior sub-bondholders, holding in excess of
8 nine billion dollars of such bonds.

9 Your Honor, as I walk to the lectern tonight, mindful
10 of Wednesday's hearings and tonight's proceedings, it reminds
11 me of a fable, one involving my namesake: Daniel walking into
12 the lion's den.

13 The bondholders recognize the seriousness of the
14 circumstances that brings the debtor and the CIPC trustee
15 before this Court. We recognize and they recognize, as
16 economic animals, and fully appreciate the extraordinary
17 circumstances that we all find ourselves in. And, yes, the ad
18 hoc bondholder group can hear and it can count and it can see
19 that the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, the various
20 commodity exchanges, the SEC, the Department of Justice and the
21 debtors all are desperate for this proposed transaction to be
22 approved.

23 And we've heard many motivations for that, but two of
24 them are what we've heard specifically: the need to stabilize
25 the financial markets and the preservation of up to 10,000 jobs

1 of Lehman employees. And those are all worthy goals, and my
2 clients recognize those goals.

3 But what we don't hear is at what cost and at whose
4 expense this transaction should be approved. What we don't
5 hear is why the Fed chose to bail out Bear Stearns and AIG and
6 just announced a potential rescue plan, like an RTC-type
7 bailout for all major financial institutions and yet somehow
8 Lehman Brothers gets left on the sidelines. We don't hear why
9 the Fed, despite choosing to ignore Lehman in connection with
10 the bailout, is, frankly, directing and mandating that this
11 sale to Barclays occur whether or not such sale is in the best
12 interests of creditors and maximizes value for creditors.

13 And, yet, the debtors and the CIPC trustee are asking
14 this Court to approve such sale, a sale whose terms, very
15 material terms, are still not resolved. And yet Mr. Miller
16 suggests that we should have a closing by 10:45 this evening.

17 And we've heard testimony, and I'll discuss that
18 further, that the marketing process with respect to these
19 assets, these assets which are the subject of this proposed
20 sale, was basically nonexistent. We don't believe that this is
21 a proper exercise of the debtors' fiduciary obligations.

22 Mr. Miller suggests when the committee initially
23 indicated its position of not either supporting or opposing the
24 transaction -- well, that's just a parochial interest of
25 creditors as if to diminish the interests of creditors, but if

1 the debtors aren't prepared to look out for the interests of
2 creditors, the creditors and the creditors' committee have no
3 choice but to do so for themselves.

4 Your Honor may recall at the conclusion of
5 Wednesday's hearing and at the urging of this Court and other
6 parties in attendance at the court, the debtors and their
7 professionals offered to hold a meeting -- or host a meeting at
8 Weil, Gotshal to answer questions about the transaction. And
9 certain important facts came out at that meeting, and they were
10 reiterated during the proffered testimony this evening.

11 For several months prior to the Chapter 11
12 proceedings, the debtors and their professionals engaged in a
13 substantial marketing process not to sell these assets but to
14 sell the entirety of the Lehman businesses. When these efforts
15 failed, Lehman sought financial and funding relief from the
16 government, which apparently was denied.

17 Days prior to the Chapter 11 proceeding, the Federal
18 Reserve took over those negotiations in an attempt to sell
19 Lehman's businesses as a whole, and only two potential
20 acquirers were identified: Bank of America and Barclays. And,
21 unfortunately, for reasons that are not altogether apparent,
22 neither of those institutions were prepared to go forward on a
23 sale for all of Lehman's businesses.

24 Left with no alternatives and left in a situation
25 where they were desperate for liquidity, the holding company

1 filed Chapter 11, and so we find ourselves here tonight.

2 Within two days of that Chapter 11 filing, the
3 debtors filed this approval motion seeking approval of the
4 proposed assets of certain businesses and certain assets of
5 Barclays belonging principally to LBI. And based upon the
6 facts and the testimonies adduced at this hearing, certain
7 things, we believe, are crystal clear. It is undisputed that
8 neither the debtors nor their advisers nor any governmental
9 agency involved attempted to specifically market the assets
10 which are the subject of the approval motion. In fact, when
11 the debtors originally entered into their agreement with
12 Barclays, they contracted away their rights to seek an
13 alternative buyer.

14 Now, I'm assuming, Your Honor, that it was the
15 determination of the debtors that that fact would not sit well
16 with the Court, that at Wednesday's hearing the Court was
17 advised that, through a negotiation between Barclays and the
18 debtors, that Barclays agreed to drop -- or allowed the debtor
19 to drop that no-shop provision.

20 But, in our opinion, it references a viewpoint, an
21 indication, a motivation that this transaction that the debtors
22 were trying to accomplish was not necessarily to get the most
23 value, the most appropriate value, to maximize value for
24 creditors, but it was to get this transaction done with
25 Barclays.

1 Since Wednesday, when the debtors were freed to go
2 out and shop these particular assets -- you've heard Mr.
3 Ridings testify that he took no affirmative steps to do so.

4 We believe this was a flawed sale process with
5 respect to these assets, a process that appears only to benefit
6 Barclays and the federal government but not the creditors of
7 this estate.

8 Perhaps as importantly, Your Honor, as I'm sure the
9 Court is aware, the economic landscape seems to have changed
10 over the last two days. Yesterday, the U.S. Treasury and the
11 Federal Reserve Board have begun discussions about a potential
12 bailout of financial institutions by the government agreeing to
13 buy distressed mortgages and distressed real estate assets of
14 these financial institutions. Just the hint of that potential
15 bailout has sent the equity of those financial institutions who
16 would be the beneficiary of that bailout soaring.

17 And, yet, the debtors and the Fed seem content or
18 determined that nothing get in the way of this transaction.
19 There is no attempt to determine, based upon the latest events,
20 whether Lehman can be a beneficiary of that potential bailout
21 or whether, in fact, as a result of that potential bailout, the
22 assets to be purchased under this transaction haven't increased
23 significantly in value.

24 And, yet, there has been no renegotiation of a sales
25 price. In fact, there has been a renegotiation of the sales

1 price. It's been a downward renegotiation, as Mr. Ridings
2 testified with respect to the real estate assets.

3 There is no final form of agreement to be approved by
4 this Court. We had a forty-minute session with counsel for the
5 debtors where they outlined to the parties in the courtroom
6 suggested changes. There's no writing. There's no opportunity
7 for parties-in-interest to review that. The first amendment,
8 frankly, was just handed out, and that's been around for a
9 couple of days, I'm told.

10 And, yet -- I'm sorry, since this morning?
11 Apparently they don't know how long it's been around.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Golden, given the pace of this
13 transaction, days merge for all of us and I don't think that's
14 a fair comment.

15 MR. GOLDEN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. You know,
16 everybody's frustrated: the parties, the debtors, the
17 governmental agencies, but so, too, are the creditors.

18 Going forward with this transaction this evening will
19 not allow anybody to assess whether this proposed bailout
20 legislation or any other restructuring alternatives,
21 restructuring alternatives that are very familiar to this
22 Court, such as a debt-for-equity swap of the 150 billion
23 dollars of securities at the holding company, could be a better
24 alternative for the creditors of the holding company.

25 There has simply been no credible evidence adduced at

1 this hearing that the price that Barclays is paying for these
2 assets represents fair value. The appraisals are not in
3 evidence. All you've heard is Mr. Miller discuss the contents
4 of the appraisals. There's no other testimony or evidence that
5 suggests the other assets being purchased by Barclays
6 represents fair value or an attempt to maximize value for
7 creditors.

8 I simply think, Your Honor, for whatever reason, the
9 debtor has failed to meet its burden with respect to the
10 appropriateness of the sale. We have heard the dire
11 consequences as to what will occur or may occur if this
12 transaction is not approved, but we have not heard credible,
13 cogent testimony as to whether the proposed purchase price
14 represents a fair value for these assets.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Golden, in effect, you're asking me
16 to weigh your speculation against their speculation. What
17 you're asking me to do is to weigh the fact that the markets
18 have turned because of the RTC-type announcement made last
19 night against the palpable, potential, devastating damage to
20 the markets to be caused if this transaction is not approved.
21 You've offered no affirmative evidence. Why should I give any
22 weight whatsoever to your argument?

23 MR. GOLDEN: Your Honor, I'm not asking you to allow
24 me to superimpose my business judgment versus the debtors'
25 business judgment. But it is not my burden, it is not the

1 burden of the ad hoc noteholders with respect to this
2 transaction, it is the debtors' burden. And they have not,
3 likewise, adduced any credible evidence as to what will happen
4 if this transaction is not approved this evening.

5 And, Your Honor, what we think, based upon the facts
6 and circumstances as we understand them, that this situation --

7 THE COURT: You weren't listening to Mr. Ridings'
8 proffer, apparently. Because in unrebutted testimony he
9 indicated through the proffer that the markets, in effect,
10 would tank. Your cross-examination didn't even touch that
11 subject.

12 MR. GOLDEN: Your Honor, you're right. We did not
13 cross-examine that. Frankly, I don't believe that Mr. Ridings
14 could credibly testify as to what would happen if these -- if
15 this particular transaction was not consummated this evening.

16 We think, Your Honor, that what this situation cries
17 out for is a denial without prejudice, but really a brief
18 delay. Not a delay for weeks or months, but a delay so as to
19 determine once and for all, has, in fact, every viable
20 alternative been considered in order to maximize the value for
21 assets.

22 I said to the Court on Wednesday -- as we sat here on
23 Wednesday and as I sit here this evening, we don't know whether
24 this transaction represents the best viable option for these
25 assets. And we can't know this because we believe there was an

1 inappropriate and flawed marketing process with respect to
2 these assets.

3 A brief delay would have several beneficial effects
4 in our view. We'd allow the parties to finally negotiate a
5 final asset purchase agreement --

6 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Your Honor. Is Mr. Golden
7 testifying?

8 THE COURT: I think what Mr. Golden is doing is
9 converting his argument into what amounts to a request that I
10 not approve the transaction this evening so that more time can
11 be spent to evaluate transactional alternatives, or
12 alternatively, to evaluate whether or not this transaction, as
13 it has evolved at the last minute, may, in fact, be the best
14 transaction. That's my interpretation. I don't consider this
15 to be testimony, I consider it to be an argument.

16 MR. GOLDEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Have I understood your argument?

18 MR. GOLDEN: You have, perfectly.

19 THE COURT: Thank you.

20 MR. GOLDEN: If we were to have a brief delay, Your
21 Honor, as I said, there would be several benefits that could be
22 achieved. A final form of agreement could be finally agreed to
23 and produced and put into evidence. What's been put into
24 evidence to date is an agreement that's not final with material
25 terms left to be negotiated. So, frankly, I don't know exactly

1 what the debtors are asking this Court to approve this evening.

2 We can determine once and for all, is there anybody
3 else prepared to pay more consideration either in dollars or
4 assumption of liabilities with respect to these assets. We can
5 determine whether the federal government is prepared to allow
6 Lehman to be a beneficiary of any proposed bailout legislation.

7 As I said, Your Honor, it's almost, in our view,
8 impossible for the debtors to have carried a burden with
9 respect to a contract that's not complete.

10 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Golden, it's my
11 determination as to whether they've carried the burden. And
12 you're not in the position to say it's almost impossible. So I
13 know it's argument, but don't go there.

14 MR. GOLDEN: Okay, Your Honor. It's our view that
15 they haven't sustained that burden. I fully well appreciate
16 that that ultimate decision is made by the Court.

17 Your Honor, it's not a secret here that the
18 bondholders are frustrated by the process. They're frustrated
19 with the lack of clarity with respect to the agreement.
20 They're frustrated by the fact that it changes every few hours.
21 They understand it but they're frustrated by that fact.
22 They're frustrated that they're asking to weigh in on a
23 contract that's not final.

24 And what the bondholders can't really tolerate is
25 that to the extent that this transaction is approved, the

1 debtors may believe that they have free license to treat the
2 balance of the assets of this estate in the same cavalier
3 manner. It's not that the bondholders don't understand the
4 pressures, the crushing economic time pressures that the
5 debtors were operating under. But nobody ever reached out to
6 the major creditor constituents. Nobody ever suggested maybe
7 there's an alternative here that is something less than selling
8 assets on what we perceive to be a discount value.

9 Your Honor, you said on Wednesday that the
10 transaction would be considered up or down this evening. It
11 leaves the bondholders very little choice. They don't like the
12 transaction in its current form, so the natural inclination is
13 to say, as our written objection was styled, that they object
14 to the approval of the transaction. But what the bondholders
15 are really seeking is an opportunity, a very brief opportunity,
16 to vet this process and to ensure that all the alternatives
17 were actually considered, to find out whether there were other
18 possibilities. We have more faith in the Federal Reserve and
19 the Treasury. We don't believe, this is my view, that should
20 this transaction not be approved that the parade of horrors
21 will not fall down on these assets.

22 So short of asking for an adjournment, which I know
23 that Your Honor was not disposed to consider when we considered
24 the DIP proceeding --

25 THE COURT: It wasn't that I wasn't disposed to

1 consider it, I denied it.

2 MR. GOLDEN: We think the appropriate course of
3 action, Your Honor, is to issue a denial of the motion without
4 prejudice so as to allow the process to unfold in a way that's
5 a little bit more transparent, a little bit more conducive to
6 allow parties -- all parties-in-interest to understand once and
7 for all whether this represents the highest and best value with
8 respect to these transactions. Thank you.

9 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Golden.

10 MR. NOVIKOFF: Good evening, Your Honor. Howard
11 Novikoff, Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz on behalf of JPMorgan
12 Chase Bank N.A.

13 Your Honor, we are not here to urge the Court not to
14 act tonight. We think Your Honor should act tonight. And we
15 appreciate the speed with which the parties have been moving.

16 We are here and we filed a limited objection because
17 we are concerned that there's a lack of clarity in at least two
18 significant respects and the way that the order affects
19 JPMorgan. And there is one matter not requiring relief of the
20 Court but a matter we do want to bring to the Court's
21 attention.

22 First, as Your Honor may recall from argument on
23 Tuesday, JPMorgan is Lehman's major clearing bank. In that
24 role, it maintains literally hundreds of clearing, operating,
25 settlement and other accounts. And in that role it makes

1 advances against securities collateral on a daily basis.

2 As of this morning, the amount of the advances, Your
3 Honor, was approximately 23.2 billion dollars. Against which,
4 JPMorgan is holding collateral.

5 In addition, Your Honor, JPMorgan is a major
6 counterparty with Lehman and various types of what we refer to
7 as Safe Harbor transactions, such as security lending
8 arrangements, repurchase agreements, ex-contracts and other
9 similar agreements. And with respect to many of those it also
10 holds collateral and holds setoff rights. And, as Your Honor
11 heard in detail on Tuesday, we have a guarantee from LBHI,
12 which is secured by collateral, which LBHI values at
13 approximately 17.9 billion dollars.

14 We have heard that as part of the purchased assets,
15 the debtor -- excuse me, Barclays is seeking to purchase 47.4
16 billion of securities. While we've been given that as a
17 number, we don't know, there's simply a lack of clarity as to
18 whether any of those securities are securities that are held by
19 JPMorgan as collateral as I just described.

20 A difficulty with the order, Your Honor, if that was
21 the intent, is it does not provide for any payment to JPMorgan
22 for that collateral. And in view of the fact I described
23 collateral -- collateral securing obligations of over forty
24 billion dollars, saying we would have access to a pool of 1.7
25 billion, along with everybody else chasing that pool, would not

1 be very satisfactory.

2 I have sought clarification and I believe obtained
3 clarification from Barclays. That, in fact, they are not
4 seeking or are not treating as purchased assets any of those --
5 any of the collateral that JPMorgan is holding for that. And I
6 would like that stated on the record, otherwise we need to
7 correct the order.

8 THE COURT: You're going to have to move to a
9 microphone, and state your name.

10 MS. GRANFIELD: Good evening. Lindsee Granfield from
11 Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP for Barclays Capital.

12 It's our understanding that with respect to the
13 purchase assets in this transaction that they do not include
14 the assets that JPMorgan is holding as its collateral.

15 THE COURT: Is that satisfactory?

16 MR. NOVIKOFF: I believe she stated it's Cleary
17 Gottlieb's understanding. I'd like to know if that is after
18 consultation with the client.

19 MS. GRANFIELD: That is.

20 MR. NOVIKOFF: The second, as I mentioned, Your
21 Honor, that JPMorgan is a major counterparty in various Safe
22 Harbor contracts. The proposed order contains an injunctive
23 provision which affects the debtors' rights in property of the
24 estate. It involves an ability on the part of Barclays to
25 choose contracts in the future for assignment and assumption.

1 And in the latest version it contains an incomplete protection
2 for Safe Harbor contracts. I would just like a clarification
3 to the effect that -- and I suspect there may be other parties
4 looking for this, that nothing in the proposed sale order
5 affects any right of JPMorgan under or with respect to any
6 securities contract, commodities contract, forward contract,
7 repurchase agreement, swap agreement or master netting
8 agreement, and I use each of those terms as defined in the
9 Bankruptcy Code, Your Honor, to exercise any contractual right.
10 And I use that term as well. Contractual right is defined in
11 the relevant sections of the Bankruptcy Code. Of a kind
12 described in Sections 362(b)(6),(7),(17) or (27), 362(o) and
13 Sections 555, 556, 559, 560, or 561 of the Bankruptcy Code.
14 I've intentionally done it, Your Honor, in that way by making
15 direct reference to the Bankruptcy Code terms. And we were
16 looking just for a clarification and understanding. But that
17 is the effect of the order so as not to affect the Safe Harbor
18 contracts.

19 THE COURT: We need a clarification, confirmation?

20 MR. NOVIKOFF: I need confirmation. And that one, I
21 believe I need from both, the debtor and Barclays, Your Honor.

22 MR. MILLER: Debtor has no objections.

23 MR. NOVIKOFF: Okay. Now --

24 THE COURT: Do we have it, I don't think so.

25 MR. NOVIKOFF: And just to be clear I'm looking for

1 that as it relates to the proposed sale order. There was an
2 order entered today commencing the SIPC liquidation which had
3 limited effects, and I'm not challenging that. I'm just
4 talking in terms of anything added by the proposed sale order.
5 That does not deal with secured party rights, secured netting
6 rights.

7 MS. GRANFIELD: Mr. Novikoff had pointed out that the
8 section that had been added to the sale order went through a
9 lot of the Safe Harbor terms. That may be just a mistake,
10 didn't add in every single section of the code that people
11 usually colloquially refer to as the Safe Harbors. So with
12 respect to those few things that weren't added to the order, we
13 recognize that the Safe Harbors exist. And we understand that
14 we are not purchasing the things that are either his collateral
15 or that we can stop the Safe Harbors from being affected.

16 THE COURT: Let me clarify what you just said because
17 we're talking about the form of order and the impact of the
18 order, if any, on what we were globally talking about the
19 universe at Safe Harbor provisions, as those terms are
20 generally understood in the Bankruptcy Code to deal with repo
21 swaps, forward contracts, securities contracts and the like.
22 And by making the statement that I just made, I am not
23 intending to leave anything out.

24 I simply want to confirm, as Mr. Novikoff has sought
25 to confirm, that it is intended that those provisions, to the

1 extent applicable outside of bankruptcy are, in fact, all
2 governing. And that nothing in the sale order is intended to
3 impair, in any respect, those contractual rights.

4 MS. GRANFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Thank you.

6 MR. NOVIKOFF: Thank you, Your Honor. And then the
7 one point I needed to inform Your Honor concerning -- as I've
8 mentioned, JPMorgan maintains literally hundreds of accounts
9 for Lehman Brothers Inc. And they continue, through the day
10 today, to continue operating those accounts. During the course
11 of the day, it was either Lehman Brothers or the SIPC trustee
12 that, during the course of the day, was the owner of those
13 accounts.

14 At this point, we are not sure whether Barclays
15 intends to use those accounts on Monday or not. We believe
16 that they will, in fact, need to use those accounts in order to
17 continue their operations. There will be a complication in
18 that when securities and cash hit those accounts on Monday, we
19 are not going to know, unless somebody tells us, whether those
20 securities and cash belong either to Barclays or to the SIPC
21 trustee; that is, are they attributable to assets that have
22 been purchased by Barclay or they have not.

23 So between now and then we are perfectly willing to
24 work with the SIPC trustee and Barclays to create a protocol so
25 that we can get instructions in how to deal with that, but we

1 have to get that resolved or we will not be in a position to
2 operate those accounts. Also, Your Honor heard that DTC, the
3 clearing organization, insisted and negotiated heavily during
4 the day and received potentially billions of dollars of
5 collateral to protect it against the possibility of liability,
6 overdrafts, etcetera, with respect to its clearing operations.

7 In the ordinary course, JPMorgan also picks up those
8 type of obligations. Indeed, last night, picked up -- they had
9 to make a fail advance to allow clearing to go forward of over
10 seven billion dollars. If our accounts are going to be used to
11 effect a smooth transition until Barclays has its accounts set
12 up with another institution, we're going to have to work with
13 them and with SIPC to make sure that -- whether it's a
14 guarantee, an indemnity, or some other procedures are put in
15 place so that JPMorgan is not at risk for providing that
16 transition. Again, we are willing to work with them over the
17 weekend to make sure that works. If, in fact, they have other
18 accounts that they can use on Monday other than ours, we're
19 delighted to do that. But we did want Your Honor to know that
20 that's something that has to be resolved from our perspective,
21 and it is not resolved yet.

22 THE COURT: Thank you for that. And let me clarify
23 that the statements you've just made with regard to transition
24 issues that are quite significant from the perspective of
25 JPMorgan Chase are not issues that affect the Court, but they

1 are rather closing issues that must be addressed in order to
2 effect an orderly transition. Correct?

3 MR. NOVIKOFF: That's correct, Your Honor. We are
4 not seeking relief from the Court on those issues, but if we
5 fail to reach agreement I did not want JPMorgan's credibility,
6 or, frankly, my firm's credibility, to be affected because we
7 didn't let you know that those issues existed.

8 THE COURT: Thank you.

9 MR. NOVIKOFF: Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Mr. Sabin?

11 MR. SABIN: Your Honor, I know the hour is late.
12 I'll be very brief. There is but one issue remaining, I
13 believe, that is not yet resolved and it arises in connection
14 with that part of this transcript, if you will, when it becomes
15 a transcript, that otherwise was raised in ours, and that is
16 related to the small amount, allegedly, of IP assets that do
17 not belong to any of the debtors that we do not believe this
18 Court has jurisdiction to sell free and clear. So assuming we
19 can solve it by drafting in the order, and assuming that's
20 acceptable to the debtors and purchaser, hopefully we could
21 schedule those assets, we could define them in the appropriate
22 places, carve them out from the relief otherwise with respect
23 to the balance of the purchase assets, which are assets of the
24 debtors. If that can be done then the entirety of our concerns
25 and our limited objection of the Harbinger funds would be

1 resolved.

2 THE COURT: All right. I hear that argument, and I
3 don't know if anybody on the debtors' side, as a matter of law
4 or as a matter of structure, would argue that notwithstanding
5 what Mr. Sabin has said it may be possible for those IP assets
6 to be transferred free and clear. I'll be the first to admit
7 that I don't know, based on this record, anything about where
8 the IP resides. And my best recollection of the statements
9 made by Lori Fife is that she wasn't so sure where, within the
10 corporate structure, those assets reside. So based on the
11 record, I think it would be hard to override Mr. Sabin's
12 concern, but I'm not eliminating the possibility that the
13 debtor could make such an argument, and it sounds like it's a
14 drafting issue.

15 MS. GRANFIELD: Your Honor, it's not a drafting
16 issue, quite.

17 THE COURT: You're going to have to talk by a
18 microphone.

19 MS. GRANFIELD: I'm sorry.

20 THE COURT: Then you're going to have to make an
21 argument --

22 MS. GRANFIELD: No, I understand, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: -- as to how, as a matter of bankruptcy
24 law, assets that are not residing within this debtor or its
25 property-owning affiliate can be the subject of a free and

1 clear order.

2 MS. GRANFIELD: No, I understand. I understand the
3 argument and Your Honor's view. Obviously, a few things in
4 terms of our ability to schedule those assets -- it may be
5 drafting and you're right. We can see on a recess or as we're
6 trying to do an order, whether we can come to agreement or not.
7 But to say that we don't want to be put into a position of the
8 proverbial death by a thousand cuts, where Barclays --

9 THE COURT: I think I'm in that position right now.

10 MS. GRANFIELD: -- you know, where Barclays obviously
11 has made a tremendous effort in trying to get to a position to
12 be able to close this transaction, so we'll see, Your Honor.
13 But I just wanted to not be too quick, and I understand the
14 legal argument and Your Honor's view -- but too quick that it's
15 just a drafting --

16 THE COURT: If you want to think about an argument
17 that would permit this Court to convey nondebtor property free
18 and clear, I'm certainly receptive to creativity. But I think
19 that at this hour, it may really be a drafting issue or an
20 issue of risk assessment.

21 MS. GRANFIELD: No, I think it's the latter. So we'd
22 have to -- it's really just having the ability to talk to the
23 client. And we'll have to make a decision in terms of,
24 obviously, the deal was we're buying the assets free and clear.
25 But we'll leave that to the recess.

1 THE COURT: Well, I think it was Mr. Miller who
2 mentioned that 10:45 was a witching hour. And I haven't heard
3 all the objectors. So absent a miracle, I think it's going to
4 be hard to make that deadline.

5 MR. MILLER: I didn't understand that PWC was
6 objecting, Your Honor. I thought we went through that earlier
7 today.

8 MR. FLICS: Your Honor, Martin Flics of Linklaters
9 for the administrators. Just as Mr. Novikoff and some others
10 have had some important clarifying points, we do as well. And,
11 in fact, the first point may relate to the very last point that
12 was just addressed. These businesses have, for many years,
13 operated as one. And what is being proposed tonight is
14 something very ambitious. And as we've indicated, we do not
15 oppose it. But it is very ambitious. It is the complete
16 separation of these businesses that have operated as one.

17 The asset purchase documents, as we have pointed out
18 in our response and in the declaration, do not do a perfect job
19 of effecting that separation. There are a number of issues
20 that need to be addressed. Those issues are important not only
21 to the European entities, but as we've heard in the last round
22 of discussion, they're probably important to the debtors as
23 well, in effecting the sale. For example, there is
24 intellectual property and IT all over the enterprise that is
25 shared. Some of that intellectual property is owned by

1 European entities and is used by the American entities.

2 That intellectual property surely cannot be
3 transferred tonight. Those entities and administration surely
4 cannot have their property compelled to be transferred. I
5 assume no one would dispute that. On the other hand, equally,
6 there are assets owned by the U.S. entities that are used in
7 the European business. There are client contracts that are
8 shared. There are source codes that are shared. There are
9 issues of confidentiality and access to source code. There's
10 various ownership rights in the IT and in the process.

11 There are a lot of issues that are very important to
12 both sides. These issues have not yet been addressed. And
13 they need to be addressed. During the course of the last
14 couple of days, we have communicated a number of the points to
15 Weil Gotshal and to the debtor. We have made our points in our
16 responsive pleading. We understand that some of them may have
17 been addressed in the proposed amendment, but we don't know.
18 We understand that others have not, but we don't know which
19 have been and which have not been.

20 We are prepared to accept a representation and
21 confirmation that all of the issues that we have set forth in
22 our response and in our declaration will be negotiated in good
23 faith, expeditiously. As I said, they're very important to the
24 administrators, and we think they're also important to the
25 estate. There are issues of our access to books and records

1 that we think we have a reasonable right, not to mention a
2 statutory obligation, to review, and all of the proprietary
3 information that is shared across the IT and intellectual
4 platforms. So as to the first of the two issues that I wanted
5 to address this evening, I would like to know -- we're not
6 going to negotiate those standing here, for sure.

7 THE COURT: Certainly not in my presence.

8 MR. FLICS: And I'm certainly not capable of doing
9 so. But we have had representations informally from people in
10 the course of this evening that they are prepared to do so. We
11 will accept that representation as a means of going forward
12 with the --

13 THE COURT: Are you also reserving rights in respect
14 to that representation?

15 MR. FLICS: -- we are absolutely reserving rights in
16 the event that we are not able to achieve a satisfactory
17 resolution on the issues that we have put of record.

18 THE COURT: Do I understand that your principal
19 concern relates to the very same intellectual property rights
20 that we were talking about moments ago, or is it different?

21 MR. FLICS: Actually, I have no idea. All I know is
22 that they have mentioned cryptically intellectual property of
23 nondebtor, and there is some issue about its ability to be
24 transferred. That happens to be an issue because I know that
25 the European entities hold some intellectual property that is

1 used by the American entities. I have no idea if that's the
2 particular point they were raising. Perhaps it's some other
3 nondebtor entity. I can only speak to the administrators and
4 their estates. I would like to get that confirmation on the
5 record so that we could proceed.

6 MR. MILLER: We'll negotiate in good faith.

7 MR. FLICS: Okay. And we reserve our rights in the
8 event that we cannot reach a satisfactory resolution. The
9 second issue is an issue that you have heard something about
10 this evening and in the course of the press, which is the so-
11 called eight billion dollars that is owed to Lehman Brothers
12 International Europe. I will not spend more than a minute on
13 the substance of that issue.

14 For parties that care to understand what the
15 administrators' current state of knowledge is on that, they can
16 refer to our pleadings. As I said, we have a declaration of
17 one of the administrators which describes their understanding
18 of the state of affairs at this time. I think I should
19 emphasize what should be obvious to all, which is that it is a
20 point of substantial interest and concern to the
21 administrators. This is not the only forum in which people
22 have been working day and night. In fact, the administrators
23 were strangers to Lehman Brothers until Monday morning and they
24 have, in the course of just the last few days with a team of
25 literally hundreds of people, tried to understand this business

1 in the very course of the business being split and to fulfill
2 their obligations as administrators.

3 One of those obligations is clearly to determine
4 their rights in respect of these claims. We want to be certain
5 that the entry of this order in no way prejudices the rights of
6 the administrators to pursue their rights and claims against
7 the debtors or third parties. We recognize, before people jump
8 up, that it does limit our rights against the purchaser. But
9 as to everyone else in the world, it should not be impairing
10 our rights in any way to seek and pursue our rights and claims
11 against those parties.

12 I did note earlier in the evening, a matter that
13 makes the issue easier for us with respect to the purchaser,
14 and I know that this is good news/bad news, which is that no
15 cash was being transferred to the purchaser. To the extent
16 that there were substantial amounts, that might have raised
17 some issue as to what the source of it was. But since there is
18 not, that is probably not an issue for the purchaser. But we
19 just want to be very clear that if anyone believes that in the
20 course of this sale, this sale order, that somehow there's an
21 intention to limit our ability to pursue, investigate and
22 assert these claims, I'd ask them to say so, because I do not
23 believe that they do.

24 THE COURT: You seem to be asking for somebody to
25 speak up. It's almost like a wedding.

1 MR. MILLER: Well, I guess sales are like weddings.

2 MR. MILLER: If there's somebody that represents the
3 rest of the world, Your Honor, I wish he would speak up.

4 MR. FLICS: Okay. Well, hearing nothing --

5 THE COURT: I hear no one disagreeing with your
6 assertion, and I trust that the order is not intended to cut
7 off rights against any parties other than Barclays.

8 MR. FLICS: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Good evening, Your Honor. Martin
10 Bienenstock, Dewey LeBoeuf, for the Walt Disney Company. Due
11 to the hour, etcetera, I can say that the issues I'm about to
12 address briefly boil down to two provisions in this order,
13 which can be dealt with either by -- if the Court cares to
14 interpret them in a way that I'll submit makes them legal or by
15 interlineation.

16 The premise of the remarks is basically that even
17 when parties get together to do God's work and do God's work,
18 when it's human beings doing it, they may also do some other
19 things that are illegal. And it's not at all surprising, based
20 on Mr. McDade's testimony, that when he sat at the table he was
21 sitting there as the representative of LBHI and LBI. It's not
22 at all surprising that the interests of subsidiaries of those
23 and those creditors of those subsidiaries were not represented.
24 And as we all know, in a commercial sense, the easiest thing to
25 do when two parties are negotiating what seems like a zero-sum

1 game, is to say the third party will pay extra money or incur
2 extra liability. And that's what we think has happened here.

3 And Your Honor, I hope, will note I'm not asking for
4 the Court to agree to some argument of exercising discretion in
5 one way or another. I'm only bringing to the Court's attention
6 that which I think the Court is compelled to do based on
7 whether something is legal or illegal. And we just have to
8 rely on the Court that even when parties are doing God's work,
9 the law is the law and it needs to be carried out. So what am
10 I referring to specifically?

11 You can tell that none of the subsidiaries or their
12 creditors were represented here by the very fact that the
13 entire purchase price is payable to the three entities, the
14 LBI, LBHI and the LB 745 LLC. We have testimony, as Mr. McDade
15 admitted on cross, that that long list of businesses,
16 everything in North America, foreign exchange, etcetera, is
17 being transferred. The asset purchase agreement says it's
18 being transferred. Those are the businesses that the
19 subsidiaries conduct. What the asset purchase agreement does,
20 in our view, and Your Honor doesn't have to decide this, is sub
21 silentio. It transfers the business of the subsidiaries: the
22 foreign exchange business, the Walt Disney Company, trades with
23 and Lehman Brothers Commercial Corp. But it doesn't get part
24 of the purchase price here.

25 Its employees are leaving, the infrastructure is

1 leaving. Everything important is leaving. He admitted it is
2 being wound down. It'll have to be. No one's left to really
3 run it for a profit. But they don't get part of the purchase
4 price. Now this, frankly, I don't think should even be
5 objectionable to the debtors or doesn't affect Barclays. I
6 don't know how the committee will come out. But if paragraph 4
7 on page 12 of the proposed order, which is the free and clear
8 paragraph --

9 THE COURT: Well, you know, the only person in this
10 room who seems not to have the proposed order is me, Harvey.

11 MR. BIENENSTOCK: The judge needs an order.

12 THE COURT: Where are we looking?

13 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Paragraph 12 -- I'm sorry,
14 paragraph 4 on page 12, carrying on to page 13. It's a
15 somewhat boilerplate provision providing that interest, which
16 is broadly defined to include claims interest and a thousand
17 other things in the assets transferred, will attach to the
18 proceeds. Now, what's happening here is in the asset purchase
19 agreement they're transferring the employees, the
20 infrastructure, ultimately the business of the subsidiaries,
21 without having the subsidiaries a party, simply by virtue of
22 the fact that technically the employees work for LBI or LBHI,
23 etcetera.

24 To give the subsidiaries a fair shake here, all
25 really that needs to happen is the Court can say the

1 subsidiaries can submit their claims to their share of the sale
2 proceeds to the extent they show that they had value, they in
3 essence were being sold, and they'll get whatever the Court
4 determines they're supposed to get when it allocates a purchase
5 price someday. And since the estate has billions of dollars of
6 real estate, it will be selling later, which we'll part see at
7 this purchase price, it shouldn't be hard to accommodate that.
8 That's one thing. It's both required -- otherwise, you have
9 subsidiaries losing all value with no compensation, and it also
10 shows the mental -- the dynamics at work, which as I said
11 before was two parties get together; the easiest thing to make
12 a deal is to take from a third party. The other provision --

13 THE COURT: It may be that they're not being --
14 nobody's taking any -- it might be that it's not taking as much
15 as collateral damage; that the consequence of selling the
16 platform is to indirectly erode value within the subsidiaries
17 that you're talking about. You have the advantage of perhaps
18 having some understanding of the corporate structure of Lehman.
19 There is nothing that has been presented to me since Monday of
20 this week, when I first became actively acquainted with this
21 case, that has instructed me on a corporate structure of the
22 various entities that you are referencing. I know about LBHI.
23 I know about LBI. I now know about the European entity. And
24 this is a learning process for probably all of us. And it's
25 happening in a hurry.

1 If what we're talking about is crafting consensual
2 language that's acceptable to the debtor and also acceptable to
3 the purchaser, that modifies the free and clear paragraph to
4 give you what amounts to a reserved right to make a claim on
5 behalf of your client -- I don't know how you do that,
6 actually -- to an allocated portion of an unallocated purchase
7 price. I think it may be an invitation to future disaster.
8 But that's just me, late in the evening, processing what you
9 said.

10 MR. BIENENSTOCK: No, Your Honor, I might have been
11 misunderstood because I submit it's simpler than that. This
12 paragraph 4 already allows everyone with any type of interest
13 in the proceeds to -- it automatically attaches the interest in
14 the assets to the sale proceeds. All I'm saying is the Court
15 can solve this problem by saying the subsidiaries can assert
16 their interest in this -- that this paragraph, as drafted, will
17 also allow the subsidiaries to assert whatever interest they
18 have. If Your Honor's theory is right, they may have zero
19 interest. But they can assert their interest --

20 THE COURT: It wasn't a theory. It was just a
21 musing.

22 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Pardon me?

23 THE COURT: I was just thinking about the
24 consequences of what you said in light of what was in the
25 order. And I may have unduly complicated it. But I think the

1 only thing, then, that's being requested by Mr. Bienenstock as
2 to this paragraph is that the debtor agree, if willing to do
3 so, that certain unnamed subsidiaries -- or maybe we need to
4 name them -- will have at least the ability to assert an
5 interest in proceeds, whatever that might be.

6 MR. BIENENSTOCK: That's right.

7 THE COURT: Mr. Miller?

8 MR. MILLER: As I understand Mr. Bienenstock, Your
9 Honor, all he wants to do is have a right to file a claim
10 against the proceeds. Is that correct?

11 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Well, for the subsidiaries to have
12 the right -- it's their proceeds.

13 MR. MILLER: Without conceding that there's any claim
14 whatsoever, or that his theory on businesses being sold has any
15 validity whatsoever, I don't see that there's any restriction
16 in this order against anybody filing a claim against those
17 proceeds.

18 THE COURT: Is that a yes or a no, Mr. Miller?

19 MR. MILLER: That's a yes, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. MILLER: But it doesn't affect the purchaser,
22 Your Honor. It's just the proceeds of the sale. And the
23 subsidiaries he's talking about, Your Honor, are subsidiaries
24 of LBI. And, therefore, he's really talking about the
25 allocated 250 million dollars that goes to LBI, which is in a

1 SIPC proceeding.

2 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Your Honor, the answer was yes, and
3 I can move on.

4 THE COURT: I'm glad I asked that question.

5 MR. MILLER: I just hope that Mr. Bienenstock and his
6 client understand that.

7 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Your Honor, the other provision
8 which is -- well, at least as important, if not more so, is in
9 paragraph 10 on page 15 of the proposed order. There's
10 language about free and clear and successor liability all
11 through this order. Except in paragraph 10, the language is
12 fairly good at saying that -- at protecting Barclays from
13 successor liability for any claims against the debtors, which
14 is conventional, and that's what we're all accustomed to. Now,
15 whether you can have a free and clear order that applies to
16 successor liability is an issue in itself. Only one or two
17 circuits have spoken on it. But that's not for tonight.

18 But generally, in the order, the successor liability
19 is spoken about as successor liability for claims against the
20 debtors. In this paragraph, in paragraph 10 -- page 15,
21 paragraph 10, section C -- the order, or the proposed order,
22 provides that the purchaser and its affiliates, etcetera, shall
23 not have successor liability as a continuation of substantial
24 continuation of the debtors -- fair enough -- or any enterprise
25 of the debtors. If that is interpreted to mean divisions of

1 the debtors but not subsidiaries, I don't have a problem. And
2 then my client would not be enjoined pursuant to the paragraph
3 on -- there is a paragraph in here enjoining parties against
4 bringing claims that you're not supposed to bring or that are
5 sold free and clear.

6 But if "or any enterprise of the debtors" is
7 interpreted as subsidiaries of the debtors, then we run into
8 the issue that Your Honor started to discuss earlier. What is
9 the authority for a creditor of a nondebtor to be told that its
10 business was transferred free and clear of liens, claims,
11 interest, successor liability? Now, if Mr. Miller is right, or
12 his suggestion turns out to be true of a possibility that the
13 businesses of the subsidiaries were not transferred, fine, then
14 presumably the action may not be meritorious unless there's
15 another good theory. And there are other theories besides
16 successor liability.

17 But, again, we're not asking Your Honor, and it's not
18 before Your Honor tonight to decide whether creditors of the
19 nondebtor subsidiaries who have causes of action as a result of
20 this have meritorious ones or not. I'm here on the black-
21 letter law, for all the reasons in our objection, which I will
22 spare Your Honor and not repeat, because I know you read them,
23 however quickly. I know Your Honor understood them. We think
24 they're compelling and ironclad. But I'm not going to repeat
25 them. For all those reasons, we don't think this language, "or

1 any enterprise of the debtors", can be interpreted to mean
2 subsidiaries of the debtors within the contours of the law.
3 Cannot do, this was overreaching, if that's what this means.
4 And this can be fixed either by striking the words "or any
5 enterprise of the debtors", or simply Your Honor saying -- Your
6 Honor issues this order, even though the drafting was proposed
7 by others, saying when you sign this you don't intend that
8 enterprise means subsidiaries of the debtors. It's as simple
9 as that.

10 THE COURT: I'm going to give others an opportunity
11 to comment on this point, because I know from experience that
12 the no successor liability provision is more often than not of
13 extraordinary importance to the purchaser. And if the
14 purchaser is willing, through counsel, to confirm that "or any
15 enterprise of the debtor" is as that term is used in paragraph
16 10(c) of the order, is not intended to extend to any subsidiary
17 of the debtors, that confirmation or an edit that's consistent
18 with that confirmation would seem to satisfy you. Correct?

19 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Yes. I just have to say, and I
20 apologize for the repetition, that this is where we just have
21 to rely on the Court. Of course, a purchaser will want all the
22 protection it can get. This -- regardless of its desire -- I
23 mean, if I'm the purchaser, why wouldn't I say no, I want that
24 to mean subsidiary. Of course I would say that.

25 THE COURT: No, the problem with --

1 MR. BIENENSTOCK: But it's illegal.

2 THE COURT: -- I don't want, at the moment, without
3 hearing from purchasers' counsel, to start to comment on my
4 interpretation of this language at this hour. But I could do
5 so. And I don't want to do that without knowing what position
6 the purchaser takes with respect to it. I'm offering that up
7 as an opportunity. Otherwise, I may say some things that you
8 might not want to hear.

9 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you.

10 MS. GRANFIELD: Good evening, again, Your Honor.
11 Lindsee Granfield, Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, LLP, on
12 behalf of Barclays Capital. The problem -- I have no problem
13 with Mr. Bienenstock's first point, but the coupling of the two
14 do cause a problem because, essentially, I see the parties to
15 the asset purchase agreement are the debtors. Those parties,
16 up until the time that the trustee came in, controlled their
17 subsidiaries. These are, I think, all wholly owned
18 subsidiaries or for the most part wholly owned subsidiaries.
19 The trustee came in, exercising his control in terms of his
20 business judgment to exercise his control here.

21 With respect to claims that in their exercising their
22 control over the subsidiaries that there should be an
23 allocation of the purchase price with respect to what's
24 happening here, you know, obviously, I agree with Mr.
25 Bienenstock, that doesn't affect the purchaser, and so we have

1 no objection to it. But if he's saying he wants his cake and
2 he wants to eat it too, which is he wants to make claims
3 against the proceeds, like everyone's just agreed, and now he
4 wants to keep open the ability not just to question the
5 business judgment of the controlling parties of the
6 subsidiaries in entering into the transaction, but he wants to
7 leave Barclays open. Barclays is making this transaction
8 possible to claims by subsidiary creditors that Barclays is a
9 successor and Barclays, after having had to renegotiate this
10 deal many times over the last few days, lost the 700 million
11 dollars in cash it was originally going to receive, lost other
12 benefits under the deal. No, we can't agree to that. And I
13 would have to go talk to my clients about how strongly we feel
14 about that. But if it were up to me, that would be it. That
15 would be the final cut.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Now, I know what you think.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor, you ready for the
18 next objector or --

19 THE COURT: Well, we sort of have a pregnant pause
20 here. This is an unresolved issue, and I don't mean to
21 diminish the significance of it by describing it as a drafting
22 point because it's not. The problem with the language as it's
23 presently drafted is that it's wildly ambiguous. The term
24 enterprise is not defined. And in common parlance it could
25 include joint ventures, other business activities. It's not

1 limited to nor does it address subsidiaries, it's actually far
2 broader. And I suppose it was made as broad as it was made
3 deliberately.

4 I don't know what the term is intended to convey in
5 terms of its meaning. Nor do I believe, based upon my looking
6 at it for the first time and not hearing any discussion as to
7 what was the intent in the drafting of it, that I'm in a
8 position now to do what Mr. Bienenstock has asked me to do,
9 which is to do God's work.

10 I believe that if it's left as it is, without further
11 definition, that we'll be revisiting this another day. And I
12 certainly don't want to invite further potentially burdensome
13 litigation over the point. Nor do I have any idea as to
14 whether or not what we're talking about is a theoretical
15 discussion, which I'm happy to engage in at any hour, or a
16 practical discussion involving meaningful rights of Walt Disney
17 Company. Based upon the pleadings filed by Mr. Bienenstock on
18 behalf of his client who is still objecting and the questioning
19 that he has presented of witnesses this evening, it's apparent
20 that he is doing what he can do to protect claims against an
21 identified counterparty. I don't know what those claims are at
22 the moment in terms of their net value, and I don't need to
23 know.

24 For purposes of this order, however, I'm going to
25 need to look at it very carefully because this is one

1 highlighted example of provisions in a sale order that I had
2 not had a chance to review, partly because it's now 10:33 and
3 because I haven't had a chance yet to review the order although
4 I promise I will do so as expeditiously as I can and given the
5 fact that there is an objector waiting in the wings --
6 actually, it is a wing over there, we're not getting this done
7 before 10:45. That's apparent. I'm going to make the
8 following suggestion, and I'm not trying to delay anything.
9 I'm going to hear all the objections this evening. I'm going
10 to hear the debtors' response to those objections, and I think
11 that Mr. Miller, or any other member of his team that he
12 designates, is entitled to speak to the Court while all of this
13 is fresh. But it's also clear to me that assuming I rule, and
14 I'm going to rule one way or the other this evening, in favor
15 of the transaction and an order needs to be entered, I think
16 that everybody should be spending a little bit more time than
17 we have this evening since it's no longer critical in terms of
18 timing to make sure that language issues, such as the issue
19 identified by Mr. Bienenstock, are addressed to the
20 satisfaction of everyone involved in the transaction.

21 I have reserved, just in case it might be needed,
22 this courtroom for tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I'm not
23 suggesting that it's going to be necessary for anybody to come
24 back. But in the same way that parties mentioned to me that
25 10:45 this evening was a time that I might take into

1 consideration, I wanted you to know that I didn't have any idea
2 one way or the other as to how long this hearing would last or
3 how much time would be required to address the many objections
4 that float in, particularly at the last minute. So to the
5 extent that it's not critically important to the transaction
6 that an order be entered this evening, I'm going to suggest
7 that time be spent to make sure that it's right and that I've
8 had a chance to consider it fully so it can be entered tomorrow
9 morning, assuming that I approve the transaction. That's my
10 comment with respect to this language point. Mr. Rosner?

11 MR. ROSNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 MS. GRANFIELD: I apologize, Your Honor. I apologize
13 to Mr. Rosner.

14 THE COURT: Once again, for record purposes, I just
15 think you're too far away from the mike unless you speak at the
16 podium.

17 MS. GRANFIELD: I apologize, Your Honor, and I
18 apologize to counsel. Just --

19 THE COURT: This is Lindsee Granfield speaking on
20 behalf of Barclays.

21 MS. GRANFIELD: Lindsee Granfield speaking on behalf
22 of Barclays. I wanted to -- just because obviously we did not
23 have an opportunity to respond in writing to the different
24 arguments or Mr. Bienenstock's writing just if I may, or if
25 it's all right with Your Honor, I'd like to cite and I'd like

1 to hand up to Your Honor the order authorizing a similar
2 transaction in the Refco Chapter 7 case where exactly the same
3 language on successor liability was used, if that is
4 permissible?

5 THE COURT: It's permissible but it's completely
6 unnecessary.

7 MS. GRANFIELD: Okay.

8 THE COURT: And I suggest that whatever language
9 appears in any other order is of no significance to me. Just
10 because something was entered in another case because it wasn't
11 picked up by a parting interest who was concerned about it does
12 not, to me, influence this outcome.

13 MS. GRANFIELD: Very well, Your Honor.

14 MR. ROSNER: Thank you, Your Honor. David Rosner,
15 Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman on behalf of the Bay Harbor
16 Entities. And to state something obvious, there's clearly some
17 momentum behind this takeover of this company and we recognize
18 that. And we recognize that in making our objection, and we
19 recognize that there are some very important human elements to
20 the transaction that I know in the dollars and cents world of
21 bankruptcy sometimes people do lose sight of and I think that
22 on all sides here nobody has lost sight of them and I think
23 that they are important.

24 One of the main arguments, and I understood
25 Mr. Golden when he said it and I thought it was right even

1 though it may not be the most appealing thing to say but it is
2 right that this global markets argument is not really directly
3 on point as to what is being done in front of Your Honor in
4 terms of this estate and what is happening to creditors.
5 Though I understand that the Court does take a macro view of
6 certain things, but one of the arguments in favor is that
7 getting this deal done will build confidence in the market and
8 that's kind of just been taken as a given, almost, by many of
9 the parties here. People can look at the way this transaction
10 actually got created and determine whether Barclays' behavior,
11 whether the position that Lehman found itself in, whether that
12 is market confidence building or if that is detrimental to the
13 market, nobody really knows. And as I think we've seen over
14 the last couple of weeks, nobody really knows a lot about when
15 people make moves -- people in positions of power make moves
16 that they think are going to stabilize. Perhaps they are
17 really unstabilizing. But what you're being asked for here to
18 do today is to be a federal court granting its imprimatur on a
19 transaction where we know -- and the PWC as the administration
20 of a U.K. entity has submitted a declaration that eight billion
21 dollars was transferred from the U.K. entity into the United
22 States rendering that entity unable to trade, delisted,
23 insolvent and that money disappeared and that money is gone.
24 And by money, I mean money and securities. Now, I will
25 respectfully disagree with you, Your Honor, on some things that

1 you have said and we have heard tonight. Unquestionably, you
2 wear the robe and this is your courtroom and you make the call.

3 THE COURT: No, this is our courtroom. It's not my
4 courtroom. This is the people's courtroom, but I'm not
5 Judge Wapner.

6 MR. ROSNER: Clearly, Your Honor. Clearly.

7 THE COURT: This is -- I'm serious about this. I
8 feel very strongly that we're here for a public purpose and my
9 name just happens to be on the door.

10 MR. ROSNER: I appreciate that, Your Honor, very
11 much. And what I will say is that I do respectfully disagree
12 with Your Honor as to whether this process comports with due
13 process as it's understood under the Bankruptcy Code and as
14 it's understood under the Constitution. It's an important
15 point. It is one that has been discussed tonight to some
16 degree but it is one that Your Honor did speak to quite
17 directly earlier, and I took those points and I just want to
18 state for the record that our view is that the eight billion
19 dollars has not been investigated. Nobody knows how that
20 happened. Nobody knows who knew about that transfer. Nobody
21 knows whether -- and by nobody here in our people's court, I'm
22 including Your Honor as saying nobody knows that, because Your
23 Honor certainly doesn't know because no one has been able to
24 present evidence to Your Honor as to who was involved in the
25 transfer and --

1 THE COURT: I'm having a problem with this argument
2 right now, so you might as well know it rather than continue
3 it. I don't understand the relevance of this. I understand
4 that it's a big number, it's a huge number. And I understand
5 that you've asked questions of Mr. McDade about his knowledge
6 of the transaction, and he didn't provide a lot of information.
7 And I paid attention to the fact that he didn't provide a lot
8 of information. But it made no impact on me because I'm
9 confident I'm going to learn a lot about this in the course of
10 this case. The question that I have for you, and you're
11 pressing this point now, is what does this have to do with
12 whether or not it is in the best interest of this estate to
13 approve this particular transaction which is the only available
14 transaction tonight? What does this have to do with what we're
15 here to consider?

16 MR. ROSNER: What it has to do with, Your Honor, is
17 akin to what you were talking about, about the terms of the
18 order, is that if you approve this sale and if you permit an
19 order to be entered like this sale order then all those
20 securities that were transferred from the U.K. to the U.S. are
21 now going to be transferred to Barclays and that will be it.
22 And anybody's rights --

23 THE COURT: I thought this was a cash sweep. Is this
24 a securities sweep?

25 MR. ROSNER: As I understood, there are going to be

1 securities. I heard tens of -- millions of -- billions of
2 dollars of securities that are going to be transferred pursuant
3 to this transaction.

4 THE COURT: Well, there's actually --

5 MR. ROSNER: And cash, but --

6 THE COURT: -- there's absolutely nothing in the
7 record, Mr. Rosner, about even what we're talking about. This
8 is a reference to news articles that appeared, speculation in
9 the press. Having read some articles about myself lately, I
10 know that there are a lot of things in the press that are just
11 plain wrong. And I've always known that.

12 MR. ROSNER: You have a declaration --

13 THE COURT: My apologies to any members of the press
14 who may be watching this or listening in. The reason I make
15 this point is that just because there is scuttlebutt about
16 something doesn't mean it's properly before me. And it's a
17 huge amount of money, and it's a matter of great significance
18 and I'm confident that it will be addressed. But I thought I
19 heard someone say earlier that there's no intention, as a
20 result of this transaction, to affect what rights may exist
21 with respect to that transfer.

22 MR. ROSNER: Well, except -- and if that's the case
23 Your Honor, and if --

24 THE COURT: Did I mishear that?

25 MR. ROSNER: Well --

1 THE COURT: I may have.

2 MR. ROSNER: Except, I think, that the purchaser is
3 seeking to cut off any rights for people to trace their
4 property to the purchaser. That's the whole point of tonight's
5 proceeding is for the purchaser to be able to say it is taking
6 assets that were in our view and in the view of PWC, who did
7 submit a declaration to Your Honor. This is not a newspaper
8 story; it is a declaration that states that in just a few days
9 the joint administrators have identified more than eight
10 billion such funds that are due to LBIE but that LBIE does not
11 hold. It's not a newspaper article. The administrators know
12 what they're -- excuse me.

13 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, it's pure speculation as to
14 what was transferred, if there was a transfer. There's nothing
15 in the record on this at all.

16 MR. ROSNER: That's the point. There's nothing in
17 the record --

18 THE COURT: I think we all agree. There's nothing on
19 the record on this point.

20 MR. ROSNER: But that's a critical omission on the
21 debtors' part because what the debtor is seeking to do is if
22 you look at the sale order what the debtor is seeking to do is
23 to have Your Honor find that the debtors had good title to
24 these assets. Not they have the right, title and interest to
25 these assets, that they have good title to these assets and

1 that upon the sale to Barclays, Barclays will have good title
2 to these assets. And those are findings that this Court can't
3 make because there has been no evidence that has been
4 introduced by the debtors. There's been no record made by the
5 debtors that these assets that are being transferred are not
6 the assets that were transferred by LBIE. The debtor has
7 chosen not to put on that case and has not put on any evidence
8 to demonstrate that it has title to the purchased assets.

9 Now, you did say just a moment ago, Your Honor, and I
10 listened to you out in the wing, that the order's going to need
11 some study? And everybody's going to need to take a look and
12 study? But that is a critical point of this order because to
13 say that the debtor has to have this Court make a finding that
14 the debtor has good title in the face of the knowledge that
15 there was a transaction of this magnitude, and what we're
16 talking about is customer property. Customer property, the
17 people who broker dealt -- who prime broker dealt with LBI and
18 whose property was then moved to the U.K. and then that
19 property disappeared and it disappeared, we believe, through a
20 transfer on Friday and no replenishment. And that, we believe,
21 is the very same property that is being sold. But the order
22 that you're being asked to enter is to say they have good title
23 today. Well, they don't have good title today. They can't
24 prove that they have good title today and they certainly
25 haven't tried to prove that they have good title today. And

1 what we've said, Your Honor, is that we have -- we own our
2 property. It is -- I think Mr. Bienenstock made this point
3 when we were dealing with subsidiaries and I believe counsel
4 for Barclays said at some point it was going to come up with an
5 argument and Your Honor said it better be a pretty darn good
6 argument but that a debtor can't sell what it doesn't own. We
7 own our property. If our property was transferred without our
8 consent into LBI, even with our consent, it's still our
9 property and they don't have good title and they can't sell it.
10 So our liability -- Barclays has to remain liable to return our
11 property or to honor our constructive trust. And that's why
12 it's highly relevant to these proceedings, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Has there been any attempt, prior to your
14 articulation of this argument this evening, to determine the
15 willingness of the parties to this transaction to reserve with
16 respect to this claim for repatriation of the funds that were
17 transferred on the Friday before the Monday of the filing?

18 MR. ROSNER: We put that in our papers as the
19 alternative to denial of the sale because it's always good to
20 have a second option on the denial that we sought. But in
21 fairness, I think that we have not had that discussion. There
22 was a meeting at Weil, I spoke with Ms. Fife yesterday; I had
23 actually sent her an e-mail and sent an e-mail to another
24 person. I wasn't here on Wednesday, but I understood that they
25 had said partners would be available 24/7. I reached out to

1 say can we have a discussion. I was advised to come to Weil at
2 3:00, which I did. And I listened to the presentation and I
3 asked my questions. And the answers I got were I don't know.
4 And I don't mean that disrespectfully or disparagingly but no,
5 the answer is no. We would reserve for our property. I will
6 tell you that, Your Honor. We would take our property and we
7 would reserve for it and say let's make sure that we have a
8 full and good claim to the ability to recover our property
9 since it was taken from LBIE and transferred into this estate
10 and is now being sold.

11 I get back to your point, Your Honor, and not to beat
12 it again, there's a lot of things -- the Bankruptcy Code is a
13 very powerful document. It gives us the ability to come into
14 court just a few days after a filing of Lehman's size and seek
15 to sell pieces of the company that Mr. Flics says it doesn't
16 even own pieces of the company. The Bankruptcy Code gives us
17 that but it doesn't give us the right to sell what it doesn't
18 own. A debtor cannot do that. 363 says property of the
19 estate. It doesn't say whatever property it wants to. It
20 can't sell my -- well, it can't sell my client's property, it
21 can't sell my property either but it can't sell my client's
22 property.

23 THE COURT: I guess I'm having a problem with what
24 you're saying. I've heard you say it, and I think you've
25 almost said it enough because I know your argument. But

1 because this isn't in the record, this is just argument, and
2 because the Lehman Enterprise transferred routinely cash and
3 other securities in staggering amounts clearing from one
4 continent to another all the time, and we're dealing with
5 issues relating to separate estates, one in the U.K. and this
6 one here, and including SIPC estate we have two, I don't know
7 whose property this is.

8 MR. ROSNER: Exactly.

9 THE COURT: And it may not be the estate that you're
10 asserting it belongs to. It may not belong to the
11 administrators. All you're doing is asserting on behalf of
12 your client a claim derivative of the claim that the
13 administrators would make. And you know what? I don't know if
14 it's right. So because we are approaching 11:00 at night and
15 dealing with no evidence with respect to the underlying premise
16 of your argument I think it's time to move on.

17 MR. ROSNER: Fair enough, Your Honor. I'll just
18 close off that piece and I will move on to the next argument is
19 that your last statement that we don't know is the statement
20 that I believe is correct. And when you talked about the
21 transfers around Lehman, which I don't think was actually
22 testified to but when you spoke of that, I'm still talking
23 about customer property. I'm talking about our property. No
24 matter how many times it gets moved, it's still our property
25 and it can't be sold.

1 THE COURT: Excuse me a second. If you're talking
2 about customer property you represent a particular fund or a
3 family of funds --

4 MR. ROSNER: Yes.

5 THE COURT: -- and segregate accounts and that kind
6 of thing. Yes?

7 MR. ROSNER: Well, yes, except that the property was
8 moved out, yes.

9 THE COURT: And how much are we talking about in the
10 case of your client? It's not eight billion dollars.

11 MR. ROSNER: No, unfortunately for them it's not --
12 fortunately, it's not eight billion dollars but it's a very
13 sizable figure that I'm --

14 THE COURT: What are we talking about?

15 MR. ROSNER: It's actually something I'd prefer to
16 tell Your Honor in chambers as opposed to make a public
17 statement on the number. But I would say --

18 THE COURT: Here we go again with hedge funds not
19 wanting to talk out loud.

20 MR. ROSNER: I didn't say they were hedge funds, you
21 said funds.

22 THE COURT: I don't know if they're hedge funds or
23 not.

24 MR. ROSNER: Thank you.

25 THE COURT: I'm just reminded of the old 2019 issues.

1 MR. ROSNER: Me too.

2 THE COURT: I understand your argument. And your
3 argument is fundamentally we need to look more closely at the
4 order so that you can protect the interest of your clients, and
5 I agree you should.

6 MR. ROSNER: There's another part of this record that
7 hasn't been made. In the overall point here that I think we
8 kind of talked about in somewhat of a generality is that they
9 have the burden of proof here. The burden of proof on each
10 element. You did talk about evidence that was given, evidence
11 that wasn't and there was some cross-examination. But the
12 debtors have the burden of proof of demonstrating each of the
13 elements that they need to demonstrate. And they didn't put a
14 record on regarding the good faith purchaser findings that they
15 are seeking to have found by Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Oh, I totally disagree.

17 MR. ROSNER: Well --

18 THE COURT: I totally disagree. One of the things
19 that I try to do, I may not succeed perfectly, but I try to
20 listen with great care to the evidence that's being put into
21 the record to support findings, and I heard ample evidence both
22 in the McDade and in the Ridings proffer that would support
23 good faith findings here. This was an arm's length
24 transaction, negotiated aggressively' it arose in two stages
25 after the deal fell apart. At the end of the weekend they

1 restarted it, it was brisk, everybody was concerned about the
2 markets, this is all going at a breakneck speed but in terms of
3 good faith, everything that I heard was indicative of arm's
4 length, good faith, aggressive negotiations. And, in fact,
5 what occurred this evening in court with respect to the fair
6 value of the real estate is a further concrete example of that
7 negotiation. So I reject completely the assertion you've just
8 made.

9 MR. ROSNER: Then I'm going to leave that one alone,
10 Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: I think that's a good idea.

12 MR. ROSNER: There are some other problems in the
13 order and I appreciate that you said that we have to look
14 carefully at it. But there is one that I want to point out to
15 Your Honor and then talk about the alternative that we were
16 talking about just a moment ago. And I don't know if this was
17 simply a drafting point, but it does seem -- didn't write the
18 paragraph number, the word "interest" -- Mr. Bienenstock
19 mentioned that the word "interest" is a defined term in here
20 and it includes all claims. But then the order itself actually
21 releases the debtor from all interests and I don't know if that
22 was the intention of the order. I'll get to it in a minute.
23 It's in paragraph -- it was in paragraph 24 --

24 (Off the record)

25 MR. ROSNER: Okay. I'm sorry. It's actually

1 paragraph 8. Thank you. Is this something revised or -- this
2 is the revised one?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's the one I handed up
4 this evening. I need that back.

5 MR. ROSNER: Okay. It's in paragraph 8 called
6 Release of Interests. And it said "that the order shall be
7 effective as a determination on the closing date all interests
8 of any kind or nature whatsoever existing as to the debtors for
9 the purchased assets have been unconditionally released,
10 discharged, and terminated". And since interest includes all
11 claims and, as we said earlier, includes everything under the
12 world, this would actually constitute a general release to the
13 debtors. And I don't think -- I'm hoping that that's not what
14 was intended, but it is what it says.

15 THE COURT: Well, here's what I think, and I
16 understand the point and you've made it and I think it needs to
17 be addressed.

18 MR. ROSNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: But I'm not ruling on it at this moment.
20 I believe that what this is about is a drafting point. And I
21 don't think that this courtroom should be converted into a late
22 night session in somebody's law firm. This is a hearing to
23 approve a sale or deny approval of a sale. We've already
24 reserved on the question of the form of the order and I've made
25 it clear that I have as a fallback, if people can't agree, that

1 we can have a further hearing to flush out ongoing issues
2 concerning the form of the order tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I
3 intend to be here. And anybody's who's interested can show up.

4 MR. ROSNER: Got it, Your Honor. I'll close with
5 just saying, and maybe I'm stating the obvious, I hope not, but
6 I recognize that it's a lot to do. It's a lot to ask this
7 Court to do that which is in the face of the massive pressure
8 that is being brought to bear on this transaction to say no,
9 I'm not going to approve it or no, I'm actually going to
10 adjourn it to allow people to take some reasonable amounts of
11 discovery investigation to learn if there are facts that should
12 be presented to the Court which we haven't been able to present
13 to the Court because there hasn't been an ability to do that.
14 I recognize that that's a huge burden to be placed on the Court
15 and that's why you wear the robe in the people's court and we
16 don't and we don't have to make that tough call. And people
17 have said that this transaction is unprecedentedial and I think
18 that's right. But unprecedentedial transactions lead to bad
19 precedence as well. And I would just ask -- urge Your Honor to
20 consider what's before you, consider the interests of the
21 creditors, all the arguments that have been made and I hope
22 that you will either deny approval of the sale, adjourn it for
23 some brief period of time or in our case, allow for a set aside
24 so that we can preserve our interests as to specific property.
25 Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Rosner. Is there someone
2 else who wishes to be heard?

3 MR. LEMAY: Your Honor, my name is David Lemay from
4 Chadbourne & Parke and I won't consume more than about three
5 minutes of the Court's time. I, too, am part of the LBIE posse
6 and I rise only to suggest what I think could be a very modest
7 change. My client, Amber Capital Management, does not seek to
8 have liabilities foisted on the transferee. We know that's not
9 really something that's ever going to happen. We don't seek to
10 stop the sale. Indeed, our client thinks that it's fine that
11 the sale goes ahead. We have a couple of drafting issues on
12 the order. I think what I've heard is I should stow those for
13 now and talk about them with counsel.

14 THE COURT: Yes.

15 MR. LEMAY: I'll do that, of course. One thought
16 that I had, though, Your Honor, that would go a long way to
17 placating the LBIE constituency, would be since there are these
18 arguments and yes, at this point there's no record to support
19 them one way or the other about who owns the assets that are
20 being transferred, one classic way that courts deal with that,
21 of course, is to just make sure that the proceeds -- the
22 proceeds that the debtors receive, both the SIPA debtor and the
23 Chapter 11 debtor, are put in a safe place where you can make
24 those decisions later on. So I am going to simply suggest to
25 Your Honor that I think the LBIE constituency would be very

1 well served, and no one else would be prejudiced, by adding a
2 minor substantive in the future and that's simply if the sale
3 price is effectively the escrow subject to further order of
4 this Court. As I say, I've got drafting issues; I'll take
5 those up later and that's really it for me, Your Honor. Thank
6 you very much.

7 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lemay. Just so I get a
8 sense of how many people who are standing are standing waiting
9 to speak? One, two, three, four? Okay.

10 MR. TALMADGE: Your Honor, I'll be extremely brief.
11 Scott Talmadge from Kaye Scholer for Wells Fargo. We had filed
12 a brief objection. It raises the same points that Mr. Sabin
13 had raised with respect to the nondebtor subsidiary's assets.
14 And we believe that that can be resolved by a drafting in the
15 order, but we'll have to see what happens with respect to that.
16 That's all I'm going to say because we might be here a while.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 MR. FLANIGAN: Your Honor, my name is Dan Flanigan
19 and I represent BATS Holding, Inc. I'll not only be brief but
20 I'll talk as fast as I can.

21 THE COURT: Don't do that because we won't understand
22 you.

23 MR. FLANIGAN: All I'm seeking, Your Honor, is
24 confirmation on the record of what I think I heard off the
25 record at the earlier presentation and that is that none of the

1 stock owned by the debtor in BATS Holding, Inc. is going to be
2 sold to Barclays in this transaction. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: That has been confirmed. Okay. Next.

4 MR. GREGOR: Good evening, Your Honor. Michael
5 Gregor of Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis on behalf
6 of Constellation Place, LLC as well as SunGard Expert
7 Solutions, LLC and certain affiliated entities that are
8 affiliated with SunGard as reflected in the opposition that we
9 filed today. Your Honor, initially, I have not yet filed a
10 property application. I request authority to --

11 THE COURT: I'm hearing you now. It's fine.

12 MR. GREGOR: Thank your, Your Honor. Very quickly,
13 with respect to Constellation, Your Honor, my client is a
14 landlord of the Los Angeles premises that are going to be
15 assumed. Section 8.14 of the APA provides that immediately
16 upon assumption there will be a sublease back and the point
17 that we have is simply that while the code allows for an
18 assumption and an assignment, there's no right to compel a
19 sublease back once the assignment occurs. And any -- our point
20 is simply that any subleasing should occur in certain forms
21 with the terms and conditions of the lease, whatever those
22 terms are.

23 The second point, Your Honor, is with respect to the
24 terms of the assumption. The APA provides that Barclays will
25 only be responsible for post-closing obligations under the

1 leases, not pre-closing, and while normally defaults are taken
2 care of with a cure, and it shouldn't be an issue with
3 landlords in particular, it does create an issue because there
4 are obligations relating the pre-closing period such as CAM
5 reconciliations, indemnity obligations and otherwise that may
6 arise post-closing but relate to pre-closing activities that no
7 one knew about prior to the closing. And our position, Your
8 Honor, is simply that in connection with the lease assumption,
9 Barclays should be required to assume the obligations as -- all
10 the benefits and burdens of the lease, not pick and choose,
11 just the post-closing liabilities with respect to our
12 leaseholds.

13 Moving on, Your Honor, with respect to SunGard,
14 SunGard has approximately forty agreements with some of these
15 debtors. It has not had the opportunity to review which
16 agreements are being proposed to be assumed and assigned.

17 THE COURT: I'm confused about something. As to
18 these agreements, are these agreements that are closing date
19 agreements or designated agreements to be --

20 MR. GREGOR: The debtors --

21 THE COURT: -- selected within the next sixty days?

22 MR. GREGOR: The debtors' notice of assumption
23 designated approximately forty-two of the SunGard agreements
24 for closing date contracts.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. GREGOR: And the point here is simply that we
2 haven't had a chance to review our objections with respect to
3 those. There may be issues pertaining to whether or not the
4 debtor entities are the parties to this contract. It may be
5 nondebtor affiliates that are the parties to the contracts as
6 well because the contracts relate to IP; they may be
7 nonassignable under nonapplicable bankruptcy -- under
8 applicable nonbankruptcy law. And we reserve our rights to
9 raise any of those objections.

10 THE COURT: All right. Your rights are reserved.

11 MR. POURAKIS: Constantine Pourakis of Stevens & Lee
12 on behalf of 1301 Properties, LLP, the owners of the 1301
13 Avenue of the Americas building. Just a couple of questions.
14 Our understanding is that the assignment will not be taking
15 place tonight but the assumption will. We just want to know if
16 the order will provide -- there will be a provision saying that
17 the assumption of the contracts is effective as of today.

18 MR. MILLER: The transaction is approved by the
19 board.

20 MR. POURAKIS: Okay. Second, in our objection we
21 just stated that the debtor failed to provide any proof of
22 adequate insurance due to performance. Is there going to be
23 any kind of reserve for unpaid rent obligations?

24 THE COURT: I'm sorry, what did you say?

25 MR. MILLER: Adequate assurance, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Adequate assurance of future performance?

2 MR. POURAKIS: Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Is the Barclays?

4 MR. POURAKIS: Well, we understand this is not
5 Barclays PLC. We understand it's a subsidiary. We're not sure
6 who the actual entity is who's buying this asset.

7 THE COURT: Well, this is the first challenge I've
8 heard to the financial wherewithal of Barclays, and I'm
9 intrigued by your position. I'm not sure what you're looking
10 for.

11 MR. POURAKIS: When we filed the papers we still
12 weren't clear as to who was the proper entity. How these --
13 our client was; it was not so that's why we raised that
14 objection -- our objection. We just wanted to make sure.

15 THE COURT: Well, my suggestion is that at some point
16 we're going to take a break and that you have a conversation to
17 adequately assure yourself that things are fine. And if you're
18 not, we can revisit it.

19 MR. POURAKIS: We're fine with that, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. POURAKIS: Thank you.

22 MR. KADEN: Excuse me, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Who are you?

24 MR. KADEN: I'm a disembodied voice. Greg Kaden of
25 Goulston & Storrs. I understand from the debtor that the

1 objectors who are on the phone were muted for a while and I
2 just wanted to make sure that we weren't forgotten about; that
3 at least one objector, myself, on behalf of two clients, has
4 objections to raise as well. And I don't mean to take my turn
5 out of order, but I can't see what's going on in the courtroom
6 and I just wanted to make sure that in the late hour people
7 didn't start filing out of the courtroom and have us be left on
8 mute on the --

9 THE COURT: Well, you did a very graceful job of
10 jumping the line. We're not going to let you --

11 MR. KADEN: I apologize, again, for the interruption,
12 Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. What I'll do is when people in the
14 courtroom have finished their presentations I'll give you a
15 signal and you can express your position for your clients.

16 MR. KADEN: I appreciate that, Your Honor. If I
17 could indulge one further request relating to my handicap of
18 being outside the courtroom. Is there some way that the
19 debtors could either have their claims agent call us or e-mail
20 to the service list the proposed form of order that's being
21 discussed?

22 THE COURT: It's a reasonable request for those who
23 are actively engaged in this hearing remotely and judging from
24 the nods that I see at counsel table for the debtors, that will
25 be done. I just don't know when it will be done but it will be

1 done.

2 MR. KADEN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

3 MR. ELROD: Thank you, Your Honor. David Elrod on
4 behalf of TransCanada Pipelines and its affiliates. We filed a
5 limited objection and I think that it has been essentially in
6 part resolved by statements that occurred when the Court left
7 the courtroom and we had an update by counsel for the debtor on
8 what's not included in the sale. And I just wanted to make
9 that clarified on the record, Your Honor, because it hasn't
10 been confirmed yet. It's our understanding that Lehman
11 Brothers Commodity Services, Inc., Eagle Energy Partners, ULC
12 and Eagle Energy Partners I, L.P. assets are not part of this
13 transaction, this purchase agreement, and that the transaction
14 will not affect their ability to operate as an entity.

15 THE COURT: It was hours ago that I heard that but I
16 believe that to be true. Ms. Fife, is that true?

17 MS. FIFE: Yes it is, Your Honor.

18 MR. ELROD: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MR. ANGELICH: Good evening, Your Honor. George
21 Angelich of Arent Fox, counsel to the Vanguard Group, Inc. The
22 mutual fund so many Americans, millions of them, indeed, trust
23 their money with Vanguard. And, Your Honor, people are in a
24 panic mode in America and not acting rationally on many fronts
25 in the economy. And I think, Your Honor, the global economy

1 argument that you've heard tonight as a rationale for speeding
2 this process up and taking the expedited approach that's been
3 taken and utilized by this Court, it needs to be responded to
4 one more time.

5 Your Honor's discretion in judgment is really the
6 only counterbalance at the moment and waiting and giving a
7 little additional time to this process and allowing the debtor
8 the opportunity to go out and market these assets for perhaps
9 an additional period of time, just two weeks, might engage a
10 competitive process because Barclays is probably not going
11 away. They're getting a fire-sale deal here for these assets
12 and I think that approving a deal in the middle of the night
13 will not do much to assure the markets of an improvement to the
14 economy, it may actually have the opposite effect. So, Your
15 Honor, we would ask that you --

16 THE COURT: Could you explain how approving this
17 transaction could possibly have a negative effect on the
18 markets?

19 MR. ANGELICH: Well, Your Honor, there could be a
20 negative impact because there could, in fact, be additional
21 value that could be realized through a competitive fitting
22 process. If there are indeed -- if there's no one else out
23 there --

24 THE COURT: I don't think you've answered my
25 question. You've made the assertion that you thought that my

1 putting this off is somehow a plus for the markets? Was that
2 your assertion?

3 MR. ANGELICH: Indeed, Your Honor. It may very well
4 be. This week we've seen an improvement in the markets. There
5 has been an opportunity for stabilization for --

6 THE COURT: I'm sorry, but I've been down this road
7 with other arguments in terms of relative speculation and I
8 think I addressed it with Mr. Golden when he was pressing me
9 hard on that very same point. So I've heard it, and I will
10 consider it.

11 MR. ANGELICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Is there anyone else in the courtroom who
13 wishes to be heard? All right. We go to the telephone list
14 and I'm not sure how many people who are participating by phone
15 are objectors. Please identify yourself and speak up.

16 MR. KADEN: Good evening, Your Honor. It's Greg
17 Kaden at Goulston & Storrs on behalf of two clients,
18 Interactive Data Corporation and 125 High Street, L.P., each of
19 which filed an objection. I'll start with Interactive Data
20 Corporation.

21 Some of my objections have been -- or reservations of
22 rights, so to speak, have been raised already so I'll try to
23 make it brief and hopefully incorporate the concessions that
24 have been made in response to those similar objections.

25 Interactive Data Corporation, to begin with, along

1 with its affiliates, provide data and related services to the
2 debtors and their affiliates, pursuant to a global services
3 agreement. The global services agreement sets forth universal
4 terms and conditions for the specific projects that Interactive
5 undertakes for the debtors and affiliates. Now, those specific
6 projects are governed by other agreements called schedules.
7 But the schedule is subject to all of the terms and conditions
8 of the global services agreement.

9 Now Interactive compared -- in the limited time that
10 we have, compared the agreements that the debtors proposed to
11 assume and assign against its own books and records but simply
12 has not been able to determine, with any certainty, which
13 agreements the debtors intend to assume and assign.

14 With that said, we would first ask that the debtors
15 and Barclay work with Interactive to determine which contracts
16 are being assumed and assigned. I believe that the parties
17 have already undertaken to do that, but given that I've been a
18 little bit handicapped on the phone, I just want to make sure
19 that we have confirmation of that for the record.

20 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.

21 THE COURT: I don't know if you heard Mr. Miller but
22 I believe he confirmed it.

23 MR. KADEN: Okay. Is that the case?

24 THE COURT: Yes, that is the case.

25 MR. KADEN: All right. Moving on then, Interactive

1 believes that the global services agreement must be assumed and
2 assigned together with any schedule that Barclay is purchasing.
3 That's because they're interrelated and we think that the
4 global services agreement provides the master terms and
5 conditions for the schedules. It actually got intertwined with
6 the schedules. So we respectfully request either that the
7 parties agree to that proposition on the record, namely that
8 the schedules can't be assumed without the global services
9 agreement also being assumed. Or if we can't get that granular
10 at this point, simply confirmation of the issue can be tabled
11 for purposes of today's hearing, without prejudice to
12 Interactive's right to raise the issue post-closing.

13 THE COURT: Is there anybody here in a position to
14 comment with regard to that statement?

15 MR. MILLER: Not the debtors, Your Honor.

16 MS. GRANFIELD: Lindsee Granfield, Cleary Gottlieb
17 Steen & Hamilton, LLP on behalf of Barclays Capital. I think
18 we indicated to the Courtroom, when Your Honor was out of the
19 courtroom, that in working through the issues of the assumed
20 contracts, that we would seek to resolve those issues. The
21 contracts that are the closing contracts, we are asking Your
22 Honor to find are assumed because with respect to many of them
23 they are needed to operate. For instance, the Lehman space on
24 Seventh Avenue and the trading floors there, and other
25 infrastructure in many, many different places. And therefore

1 not to have -- or to have some cloud would be a problem.

2 But having said that, in terms of trying to work out
3 with the counterparties to assume contracts, are there issues
4 about identification? Is there an issue that -- what's the
5 full contract? We obviously realize we have to live within the
6 bounds of 365 in terms of assuming a full contract, can't break
7 up the contract, have to pay the cure cost. Plus, in terms of
8 any accrued amounts, when we assume the contract, even if
9 accrued amounts aren't due yet but then the due date comes up,
10 that's going to be for our account. So that's pretty much the
11 comfort I can give at this time.

12 THE COURT: You don't have to agree that's sufficient
13 but that's all you're getting.

14 MR. KADEN: Pardon me, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: I said, you don't have to agree right now
16 that that's sufficient but I've heard what she said and I think
17 that's all you're getting in court this evening. Is that
18 satisfactory?

19 MR. KADEN: I guess it's not satisfactory to the
20 extent that these documents are -- the two agreements are
21 physically separate documents. So, to the extent we're talking
22 about assuming all the benefits of one contract, if we can
23 agree that it's one contract, then of course we have no
24 objection. But we just don't know whether the debtors or the
25 Barclays will have an issue that these are, in fact, separate

1 contracts and they don't actually go hand in glove together as
2 part of the assumption and the assignment.

3 So I guess it could be a moot point that we can't
4 even tell whether it's in on the list. For all we know the
5 master agreement already is on the list. But I guess, to the
6 extent I popped a hole into the current circumstances, I would
7 like to reserve the right to raise the argument, with respect
8 to the global services agreement, that that also must come
9 along with any assumption and assignment of the schedules.

10 To the extent that we can't consensually agree or
11 indeed to the extent that the global services agreement isn't
12 already sitting on the schedules to be assumed and assigned or
13 a different name that we simply just can't identify for our
14 books and records.

15 THE COURT: I'm not sure how to say goodbye but I
16 think we're done with what you had to say. I didn't mean to
17 make light of what you said, it's just that you're on the phone
18 and nobody said anything and I think we're done with what you
19 had to say. Anything more?

20 MR. KADEN: I'll move on, then. Finally, although
21 Interactive has determined the cure amount under its contract
22 to, at least the amount scheduled by the debtors, which is
23 596,792 dollars and, I guess, six cents. We think it may be
24 more. However, since the debtors have already scheduled 596K
25 as an undisputed cure amount, we'd have to immediately pay this

1 as an undisputed cure without prejudice to Interactive's right
2 to argue after discussion. Hopefully we can reach a consensual
3 resolution but they will argue, post-closing, that additional
4 cure is required. And I want to make sure that that argument
5 is reserved under Mr. Miller's general postponement of cure
6 objections but also to clarify that any undisputed cure amount,
7 if we agree, as we believed in the 596,000 dollars will be
8 immediately paid as part of the closing.

9 THE COURT: I'm not going to say anything in response
10 to that. Whoever wants to respond, please do?

11 MS. GRANFIELD: Lindsee Granfield, Cleary Gottlieb
12 for Barclays Capital. The proposed order is providing that to
13 the extent -- well, that the cure amounts will be paid as soon
14 as practicable on the earlier of the consent of the party to
15 the cure amount on the schedule, the deemed consent of the
16 party because they don't object on October 3rd or after your
17 Court's determination of the cure amount after dispute.

18 So no, we can't agree that again another party wants
19 to have its cake and eat it too, that if there's a dispute
20 about the amount we either reach agreement, get paid as soon as
21 practicable or Your Honor will determine it.

22 THE COURT: That sounds perfectly consistent with due
23 process and I think everybody can agree that that's so, even
24 this briefly into the case. There'll be an opportunity to be
25 paid an amount that you agree. If you don't object you'll get

1 the deemed amount and if there's a problem there'll be a
2 hearing.

3 MR. KADEN: Fair enough, Your Honor. Thank you.

4 If I can move on now to my second client, which is
5 125 High Street.

6 THE COURT: What time zone are you in?

7 MR. KADEN: What time zone?

8 THE COURT: Yes.

9 MR. KADEN: I'm in the Eastern Time Zone.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, then you know how late it
11 is. I wish you'd expedite -- I don't mean anything by this but
12 we've really been going for a long time. It's a very, very hot
13 courtroom and we have a tremendous amount of work to do before
14 we can all go to sleep. So I really ask you to limit your
15 remarks if you can.

16 MR. KADEN: Okay, I will. I'll get to the main
17 issues and many of them have already been raised. So I will
18 try to be as brief as possible and I apologize and I appreciate
19 the Court's indulgence.

20 I would like the same confirmation that the prior
21 landlord has asked for, that the rights of my landlord at 125
22 High, under the lease, with respect to any sublease back to the
23 debtors are preserved consistent with the terms of the lease.

24 I think it was already confirmed on the record for
25 the other landlord but I want to make sure that that same

1 confirmation as to that the lease says what it says with
2 respect to treatment of subleases and that there's no attempt
3 here being made to overrun the provisions of the lease with
4 respect to subleasing, if there is a sublease contemplated on
5 this matter.

6 MS. GRANFIELD: With all due respect to counsel, I
7 have no idea what your lease says or what its terms are. And
8 so I can't confirm to you anything at this moment. But I can
9 confirm that we'll have to live with what 365 gives us in terms
10 of rights. That's all I can give you at this moment.

11 MR. KADEN: Fair enough.

12 THE COURT: Does that do it?

13 MR. KADEN: The same confirmation as to year-end
14 reconciliations with respect to 125 High, if the year
15 interrupts, to the extent that they're payable under the lease,
16 that those provisions will be honored as well?

17 THE COURT: Counsel, let me tell you what I think is
18 happening here, and you can't see what's going on in the
19 courtroom, which puts you at a disadvantage. You're doing a
20 really effective job of being tenacious and pressing your
21 points but I don't think you're winning them. I think that all
22 you're doing is getting reservations of rights, which is about
23 as much as you can expect at this hour.

24 And I'm also going to acknowledge, both to you and to
25 everybody in the courtroom that I'm getting tired. I've been

1 on the bench for a long time and I've been trying to
2 concentrate in a very important hearing and I think we have to
3 stop talking about these issues.

4 MR. KADEN: Fair enough, Your Honor. I apologize.

5 THE COURT: There's no reason to apologize. This is
6 an important hearing and you have clients to represent. I'm
7 just telling you that if you were watching what's going on you
8 would realize that you're losing me. I can't pay attention to
9 what you're saying and I'm trying to.

10 MR. KADEN: Okay. So then with that I will take your
11 cue and close my arguments there.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 MR. HAYES: Your Honor, one more telephone objection
14 that'll take about thirty seconds.

15 THE COURT: Where are you?

16 MR. HAYES: My name is Dion Hayes, I'm with
17 McGuireWoods. I represent Toronto Dominion Bank, also Eastern
18 Time Zone.

19 THE COURT: Are you in New York City?

20 MR. HAYES: No, sir.

21 THE COURT: Okay, then I'll listen to you.

22 MR. HAYES: We have significant claims, Your Honor,
23 against Holdings LBI and certain LBI subsidiaries. We filed,
24 essentially, a joinder in Mr. Bienenstock's objection that he
25 filed on behalf of RBS. We join in his comments that he

1 articulated earlier with respect to paragraphs 4 and 10 of the
2 order. I haven't seen the order unfortunately but as it was
3 described in the hearing earlier, we share his objections to
4 those provisions. Thank you, Judge.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. ROESCHENTHALER: Your Honor, this is Mike
7 Roeschenthaler, also for McGuireWoods in the Eastern Time Zone.
8 I represent Access Data Corp and CNX Gas Company. Briefly,
9 Your Honor, Access Data Corp, based on the representations made
10 by counsel for the debtor about asserting late claims or
11 rejection of claims, at this point we're fine with that,
12 subject to our right to assert those claims because we -- the
13 claim of Access Data is about ten times what has been listed by
14 the debtor.

15 And for CNX Gas Company, our claim related to EU
16 Energy and based on representations by the debtor earlier, that
17 is no longer part of the sale. If that's the case, then we
18 have no objection to the sale going forward.

19 THE COURT: Thank you.

20 MR. ROESCHENTHALER: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Is there anyone else on the phone? Okay.
22 Then you can mute your lines.

23 It's now 11:30 and what I said I meant, I'm kind of
24 exhausted. But I think that it's also important for us to get
25 through this. I recognize that many of the people who are

1 sitting out there have not eaten and haven't had a break in a
2 while and I think due process also includes no cruel and
3 inhuman punishment. And so I think that it may be timely,
4 before I hear from the debtors and/or also from the purchaser,
5 to take a fifteen minute break so everybody can refresh
6 themselves a little bit.

7 So since it's already as late as it is, it might as
8 well be a little bit later and let's take a fifteen minute
9 break and I'll see you at 11:45.

10 (Recess from 11:30 till 11:45 p.m.)

11 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Miller?

12 MR. MILLER: Good evening again, Your Honor. And
13 given the lateness of the hour, Your Honor, I expect to be
14 exceedingly brief, Your Honor. There have been an awful lot of
15 objectors who have stood at the lectern and it's, sort of, hard
16 after listening to twenty odd people, to remember all of the
17 comments that were made and objections that were made. But
18 there's one basic theme, Your Honor, that has gone through the
19 statements by Mr. Golden, Mr. Rosner and some others. That
20 apparently there is the ability to stop everything, take two or
21 three weeks or maybe two or three months, while we explore
22 every possible alternative. And there is no recognition, Your
23 Honor, that we have a patient that is hemorrhaging on the
24 operating table and there is no intensive care ward for this
25 patient.

1 Things have happened, Your Honor, in the last two
2 days. First of all, we have a SIPC proceeding, Your Honor. A
3 trustee has been appointed for SIPC and the assets of LBI are
4 under the jurisdiction of that proceeding. They're gone, Your
5 Honor. And as it was pointed out in the testimony today, there
6 are 639,000 accounts with a value of something like 138 billion
7 dollars that are sitting now waiting transfer. And if this
8 sale doesn't go through, Your Honor, those accounts are going
9 to be stuck. And they're going to be stuck for months and
10 months.

11 Mr. Golden says that he protects the interest of
12 creditors. I would say, Your Honor, the debtor is protecting
13 the interest of creditors. If this transaction doesn't go
14 through, Your Honor, LBI is out of business. It already is --
15 will be in a SIPC liquidation proceeding.

16 There is no money at LBHI. The DIP loan will become
17 due, 200 million dollars, as payable. Look what happened
18 yesterday, Your Honor. The CME closed us out and we took a
19 loss of one billion, six hundred million dollars. This
20 administration is finished if this transaction is not
21 completed, Your Honor.

22 It's a shame, Your Honor, that the 7,000 people who
23 are waiting for transfers today in various computer points
24 throughout the country, did not get what they expected to. And
25 I'm not being critical of anybody, Your Honor; everybody has a

1 right to express their views. But we are in a situation in
2 which we have a fragile asset that can't. This is not a case
3 where you can sit and go out and explore every single
4 opportunity. And in that connection I might say, Your Honor,
5 that for months, certainly going back to the collapse of Bear
6 Sterns and before that, Lehman has been deleveraging. It has
7 been participating in every effort to deleverage its balance
8 sheet.

9 It got down to -- let me call it the final round,
10 where there only were two possibilities: the Bank of America
11 and Barclays. And the Bank of America went off and did
12 something else. Barclays -- that transaction was unable to be
13 consummated. So in the exercise of good business judgment,
14 management and the board of directors turned to get the best
15 transactions they could get in the limited time.

16 And, Your Honor, there aren't many candidates that
17 could do this. You needed somebody with the kind of capital,
18 credit standing of Barclays. There aren't that many people out
19 there. And you can't go around and cherry pick these assets,
20 Your Honor. This is an integrated operation.

21 So what is happening, Your Honor, we are protecting
22 the customers. There's testimony on the record, Your Honor, as
23 to what the consequences would be if this transaction doesn't
24 go forward. Both Mr. Ridings and Mr. McDade have indicated
25 there won't be anybody in the building. If there's no

1 assurance of an ongoing operation for the LBI employees, which
2 are most of the employees in 745 Seventh Avenue, they're not
3 going to stay there, Your Honor. These are people who have
4 bills that they have to meet, they need employment. They need
5 some element of certainty. They're all expecting, and I'm not
6 putting any pressure on Your Honor, they're all expecting that
7 Your Honor will rule --

8 THE COURT: The pressure is already there, Mr.
9 Miller.

10 MR. MILLER: I'm sorry?

11 THE COURT: The pressure is already there.

12 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Not from you.

14 MR. MILLER: No, no. I was looking for that woman.
15 There is pressure on everybody, Your Honor. I mean, I was just
16 saying to somebody, here we are sitting in a courtroom at 5
17 minutes after 12, and we've been here for a long time, and that
18 is evidence of the concern that everybody has. And I
19 understand the issues, Your Honor. As we said on the very
20 first day, this is an extraordinarily exceptional case. There
21 is so much at stake here. And if we miss this opportunity we
22 are talking about a wholesale liquidation with all of the
23 consequences that come out of that liquidation. And people can
24 speculate as to what's going to happen.

25 I mean, I was a little shocked at Vanguard, who

1 happens to be a competitor of Neuberger, saying don't close
2 this. It'll be a good thing for the marketplace, for somebody
3 maybe. So I think that argument, Your Honor, just doesn't
4 carry water.

5 Now I would turn, just for a minute, Your Honor, to
6 the LBIE thing, which is confusing this whole matter. I point
7 out, Your Honor, LBIE went into administration before the
8 Chapter 11 case was filed. And PWC froze all transactions
9 immediately and it became the administrator. So those
10 transactions were frozen.

11 Now, what we're talking about, Your Honor, is eight
12 billion or five billion, whatever it might be, Your Honor, that
13 was a cash sweep. Cash, we're not transferring any cash to
14 Barclays, that's out of the agreement. So if Mr. Rosner or
15 somebody else has a claim, they can assert a claim. It has
16 nothing to do with this transaction.

17 And I would also point out, Your Honor, that PWC as
18 the administrator is not opposing the sale. In fact, they're
19 supporting the sale. They're just reserving their rights and
20 they should reserve their rights. If they have a claim, this
21 is all going to be investigated. But we have to look at the
22 bigger picture, Your Honor, what happens if we don't close this
23 transaction. And Mr. Ridings testified, Mr. McDade testified
24 as to the consequences that will affect these estates. We
25 cannot reverse what has already happened.

1 And in the short period from Wednesday to Friday,
2 notwithstanding that Your Honor approved the sale procedures,
3 we lost the confidence of the market. And if you don't approve
4 this transaction, Your Honor, LBI is finished as an operating
5 business. It will not add any value to anybody. And all we
6 will have left, Your Honor, is a winding down estate and
7 holdings. And if that building is empty, Your Honor, it won't
8 be worth 900 million dollars because that's the nature -- that
9 appraisal that we got assumed a value with the building in use.

10 So the dangers here, Your Honor, are extraordinary.
11 This is a good transaction, Your Honor. We spent a lot of time
12 listening to landlords. All of those issues, Your Honor, are
13 minor and will be resolved in one way or the other. Either
14 Your honor will decide them or there will be mutual
15 arrangements and agreements among the parties.

16 The drafting of the order, I think, Your Honor, if we
17 all sit down in good faith we will come up with an order. I
18 think we will come up with an order tonight if Your Honor were
19 to approve this transaction.

20 THE COURT: I'm prepared to stay here for as long as
21 it takes if you're prepared to stay here for as long as it
22 takes.

23 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I can't think of a better
24 place to be.

25 THE COURT: Do you want to order pizza? How do you

1 want to nourish yourself between now and the entry of the
2 order?

3 MR. MILLER: With pepperoni?

4 THE COURT: Whatever you want.

5 MR. MILLER: I agree with Mr. Bienenstock -- maybe
6 let me rethink that. Your Honor, I would stay without food. I
7 think that's a good thing. And I would lock all of the
8 latrines. I'm sorry; I withdraw that remark, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Unfortunately, it's on the record of this
10 proceeding.

11 MR. MILLER: And, Your Honor, the proceeds of the
12 sale, the 250 million dollars, is going to the SIPC trustee,
13 the one billion 290 million dollars is going to the estate.
14 There is a creditors' committee. Those proceeds are safe.
15 Hopefully, we're going to go into the more conventional
16 procedures of Chapter 11.

17 I don't want to use the melting ice cube. It's
18 already half melted, Your Honor. The steps have had happened,
19 the things that have happened since Wednesday, make it
20 imperative that this sale be approved. In the interest of all
21 of the stakeholders, including Mr. Golden's clients, they will
22 benefit by this, Your Honor, because if the alternative
23 happens, there will be very little to distribute to creditors,
24 if anything.

25 So we submit to Your Honor that this sale should be

1 approved and should be approved tonight. And we should get the
2 orders entered and get the transfers done before there's any
3 other prejudice and harm. Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

5 MS. GRANFIELD: Really brief, Your Honor, because I
6 won't tread over any ground that Mr. Miller just went over.
7 The importance, if Your Honor is so disposed to approve the
8 transaction of staying here, getting the order done and getting
9 it entered tonight, my client wanted me to express to you the
10 importance is really not only in terms of the operations, the
11 moving of the money, the preserving of the value for this
12 estate, but the importance in terms of staying here and get it
13 done tonight is really with respect to the employees who we've
14 already heard many times have really had a horrible week. They
15 have had a bit of hope in terms of being able to return to a
16 more business as usual. And we're really concerned if they
17 don't wake up tomorrow and see that not only has it been
18 approved but the order's been entered and we're moving forward
19 towards closing.

20 Just generally, with respect to the objections,
21 Barclays Capital cannot pay out the sums that have been put on
22 the record tonight and subject itself to collateral attack.
23 It's not doing this transaction to paint a bullseye on its back
24 for every subsidiary creditor, landlord, fund that wants to
25 figure out who's a deep pocket, oh, Barclays is doing this deal

1 so it's one of the three or four deep pockets that could have
2 and so we're going to reward by miring it in collateral
3 litigation. If there's really any chance of that, it won't
4 happen. And this will all be for naught. So we do have to
5 keep our eye on that ball.

6 And then finally, Your Honor, in the proffer of some
7 of the testimony tonight, and this had been said before, and it
8 may have been the belief of the parties who had said it, but
9 it's important with respect to Barclays and its relationship
10 with regulators in the U.K. that we wanted to make a pointed
11 statement that it has not only been the U.S. regulators that
12 have really gone above and beyond to try and facilitate this
13 transaction. But the regulators in the United Kingdom have
14 done so as well. And there was speculation, really, that maybe
15 the U.K. regulators had some to do with not having the prior
16 transaction that was worked on last week come to fruition. And
17 it turns out that's not the case. It really was not a
18 regulatory issue but just a question of the structure of the
19 transaction would have required Barclays to have a
20 shareholder's vote in order to do the transaction and that just
21 was not going to happen with the precipitous terrible things
22 that were happening at the time. And so, we just wanted to
23 correct the record with respect to that. And with that, I'll
24 turn it over to others.

25 MR. BIENENSTOCK: May I respond for a moment, Your

1 Honor?

2 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

3 MR. BIENENSTOCK: I just want to point out that,
4 number one, we all understand the importance of the
5 transaction. And it's very easy for a party sponsoring it to
6 say, and I won't do it unless you give me something illegal, so
7 give it to me, Judge. I'd like to point Your Honor to some
8 evidence Your Honor admitted, the contract. Nowhere in that
9 contract does it say they need an order that's free and clear
10 of successor liability from creditors of non-debtor
11 subsidiaries. Nowhere. This is just overreaching and gambling
12 that Your Honor feels this is so important that you'll do
13 something illegal so they'll close tonight. Thanks.

14 THE COURT: It's my job to do what the law permits in
15 the exercise of my discretion. This week, more than any other
16 week since I was appointed to the bench, I have felt the
17 awesome power of this job. And it's now Saturday morning.
18 I've given a lot of thought the objections. I reviewed each
19 one that I could get. They were flying in this afternoon one
20 after another. And I categorized them in my mind and
21 considered carefully whether it was permissible for me as a
22 judge in this district to approve a transaction this momentous
23 on such an extraordinarily fast schedule. And I gave
24 consideration to the due process considerations that have been
25 articulated in objections both orally and in writing. And I

1 have concluded that this is really not a question of due
2 process being denied. This is a question of due process being
3 pursued in good faith by all parties to the transaction, even
4 the objectors. It is a testament to the importance of this
5 transaction that this courtroom is still packed. I have no
6 idea what's going on in the overflow rooms. This is not an
7 ordinary Chapter 11 case.

8 This is not simply approving the transaction because
9 Mr. Miller is putting pressure on me to do so. This is not
10 approving the transaction because I know it's the best
11 available transaction. I have to approve this transaction
12 because it's the only available transaction.

13 I believe that one of the remarkable aspects of our
14 Bankruptcy Code, as it has evolved, is its remarkable
15 flexibility to different circumstances. The lawyers who are
16 appearing before me this evening are truly among the best and
17 the brightest in the field. And some have participated in the
18 evolution of bankruptcy as a field, nationally and
19 internationally. We must close this deal this weekend not
20 because the markets demand it, although that's certainly a part
21 of it. Lehman Brothers became a victim. In effect, the only
22 true icon to fall in the tsunami that has befallen the credit
23 markets. And it saddens me. I feel that I have a
24 responsibility to all the creditors, to all of the employees,
25 to all of the customers and to all of you. Arguments have been

1 made this evening by objectors, some questioning whether or not
2 if I were to delay approval another better transaction might be
3 realized or discovered. And that's a preposterous notion. As
4 I said on Wednesday, it's very apparent to me that for a
5 transaction of this sort to happen, only Barclays can do it.
6 Only Barclays has the support of the regulators. Only Barclays
7 is prepared to close. Only Barclays can deliver the customer
8 accounts to safe harbors. And the customer property, which is
9 the principal concern of the SIPC trustee, a case which is also
10 pending before me now, will be best protected by virtue of
11 approving the sale.

12 The objectors, and I'm not putting them all in the
13 same basket, principally, Mr. Golden and Mr. Rosner's clients,
14 argue passionately that I should not be unduly influenced by
15 the arguments made by the debtors that the markets will, in
16 fact, tank if this deal is not approved and that more time
17 should be afforded to searching for an alternative. I am
18 persuaded that to do so would be reckless. I believe that the
19 debtors have acted in the utmost of good faith in trying to
20 make the best out of a terrible situation. The comments made
21 by the SIPC trustee so many hours ago in reference to the
22 cooperation, the unusual cooperation that has characterized the
23 commencement of the SIPC proceeding and the coordination of
24 that proceeding with this bankruptcy case demonstrate not just
25 that New York lawyers and consultants can be good citizens but

1 that we all recognize that we're engaged in something here
2 that's very special. This is the most momentous bankruptcy
3 hearing I've ever sat through either as a lawyer or as a judge.
4 And I'm guessing I'm not alone in that sense.

5 One could be a theoretical bankruptcy jurist and say
6 transactions such as this should always be subject to more time
7 so that parties can better assess the consequences of the
8 transactions. Bankruptcy Rule 6003 which was enacted recently
9 was designed among other things to slow down activities in the
10 first twenty days of big bankruptcy cases. This is Friday.
11 This case was filed on Monday. What we're doing is unheard of
12 but imperative.

13 I am completely satisfied that I am fulfilling my
14 duty as a United States bankruptcy judge in approving this
15 transaction and in finding that there is no better or
16 alternative transaction for these assets, that the consequences
17 of not approving a transaction could prove to be truly
18 disastrous. And those adverse consequences are meaningful to
19 me as I exercise this discretion. The harm to the debtor, its
20 estates, the customers, creditors, generally, the national
21 economy and the global economy could prove to be incalculable.

22 Moreover, it's not just about avoiding harm.
23 Approving the transaction secures whether for ninety days or
24 for a lifelong career employment for 9,000 employees at Lehman,
25 and holds together an operation the value of which is really

1 embedded in the talent of the employees, their knowledge, their
2 relationship, their expertise and their ability to create value
3 to the economy.

4 Earlier today, I guess it was yesterday, I said that
5 I was concerned about the real estate value in this
6 transaction. I still am but I'm getting over it. I believe
7 that sophisticated negotiations cannot be parsed neatly into
8 the constituent parts because they're integrated and
9 interrelated in the result of give and take. I'm unable to
10 value a piece of New York City real estate and there's been no
11 real evidence presented although the appraisal has been alluded
12 to. I suppose it is theoretically possible that if the office
13 building at 745 Seventh Avenue were subject to marketing and
14 auction procedures over a lengthy period of time and were
15 somehow viewed as a quasi trophy property that perhaps it might
16 bring more value. But that's speculation. As to the data
17 centers, I have no idea. I'm not even sure I know what a data
18 center. I expect it's a place that has servers and deals with
19 the back office needs of a large operation such as this. And
20 that, in a sense, describes part of the problem for me as a
21 judge here. I know that I need to approve this transaction. I
22 am absolutely confident in my judgment. But I also know that
23 this is so exceptional relative to the experience that I have
24 had both as bankruptcy lawyer and as judge to know that it
25 could never be deemed a precedent for future cases unless

1 someone could argue that there is a similar emergency. It's
2 hard for me to imagine a similar emergency.

3 And so, as to those objectors who say it would be
4 establishing bad precedent to approve this transaction, I say
5 no. This is not a bad precedent. To the contrary. It's an
6 extraordinary example of the flexibility that bankruptcy
7 affords under circumstances such as this. It's an example that
8 creative minds working diligently day and night even under the
9 worst of circumstances can create remarkably complicated
10 transactions that preserve value. I am proud to have been part
11 of this process.

12 I'm also satisfied that if everybody stays who needs
13 to comment on the order that some of the legal issues that have
14 been raised during the objection phase of this hearing can be
15 addressed. I note the arguments made by Mr. Bienenstock on
16 behalf of the Walt Disney Company, that I can't do anything
17 that's illegal. And he's right. However, it's not illegal to
18 enter orders that include from time to time language that
19 people dispute or language that may be ambiguous or language
20 that might have been better drafted. I regret to say that I
21 think I do it every day. And most of it's because I enter
22 orders that you draft. So, I don't think it's illegal for me
23 to do something that may lead to an argument in the future as
24 to what the language of the order means.

25 As far as Mr. Rosner's arguments are concerned and

1 those of others who have talked about the sweeping of cash out
2 of the European operations on the Friday before the filing
3 here, I'll repeat what I referred to earlier. There's no
4 evidence with respect to that although there's been a lot of
5 discussion about it. I'm satisfied that given the fact that
6 Barclays is not taking cash and the only thing that came in to
7 the debtor from Europe was cash that in practical terms we
8 should be safe. The cure objections will be dealt with in
9 accordance with the understandings and representations made by
10 Mr. Miller on behalf of the debtors. And I presume that unless
11 that's worked out consensually that at some point I'll have an
12 opportunity to hear evidence with regard to proper cures.

13 I believe I dealt with the matters that are before me
14 and that the remainder of the evening should be spent with
15 those lawyers who need to address the substance of the order to
16 work together to develop that in a form that's either purely
17 consensual, or to the extent it's not, can be entered by me
18 provided that the areas of disagreement are highlighted. I
19 will remain available for as long as it's necessary so that to
20 the extent there is a need to put anything on the record or to
21 confer with me that you'll be able to do so. I would note,
22 however, just in the interest of avoiding an all-nighter that
23 to the extent it would be feasible for the order to be
24 completed given the fact that it is mostly done within the
25 next, say, forty-five minutes, that would be desirable.

1 Would you like to be heard, sir?

2 MR. KOBAK: Yes. James Kobak, Hughes, Hubbard & Reed
3 for the SIPC trustee. There's also an order in the SIPC case
4 which -- a proposed order which we presented to Your Honor
5 which, essentially -- in fact, what it does is adopts and
6 incorporates by reference the order approving the sale in the
7 Chapter 11 case and to our proceeding.

8 THE COURT: Whatever that order might end up saying,
9 I take it. So that in effect --

10 MR. KOBAK: Yes, that's correct. But when that order
11 is entered, if Your Honor would entertain the other order
12 because it is a condition to approval of the contract.

13 THE COURT: I certainly will.

14 MR. KOBAK: I have a copy with me.

15 THE COURT: Do you have a copy of that order?

16 MR. KOBAK: Yes. If I may?

17 THE COURT: You may. Does it also have an electronic
18 disk that goes with it?

19 MR. KOBAK: Yes, it does.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. KOBAK: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Your Honor, may I be heard?

24 THE COURT: Mr. Bienenstock?

25 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Yeah. I'm trying to take Your

1 Honor's cue. I think Your Honor came up with a solution to the
2 issue I had raised in terms of ambiguous language which might
3 obviate any change in that regard depending on whether Your
4 Honor feels inclined to comment on the following question. Is
5 it fair for us to infer from Your Honor's remarks that if we
6 leave the language alone and one day we'll come back to Your
7 Honor, if necessary, to resolve its ambiguity that Your Honor
8 would be inclined based on your first comments that you'll
9 interpret it based on what was legal?

10 THE COURT: I'm obligated as a matter of my oath to
11 interpret everything in a manner that I consider legal.
12 Occasionally, however, I'm told I've made mistakes.

13 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Well, we all do. But I asked the
14 question for this reason. There is bankruptcy jurisprudence
15 that if a bankruptcy judge, like, discharges a third party
16 claim and you don't object, you're stuck with it even though it
17 was illegal. And I just want to be clear here that if we leave
18 the language alone, make the evening shorter, but come back to
19 Your Honor, Your Honor's intent is to interpret it as to what
20 would have been legal.

21 THE COURT: I'm disinclined to ever state from the
22 bench, even when there are only a couple of people in the room,
23 what my intent is. I'm prepared to say, however, that in the
24 event that parties were to return to this court at some time in
25 the future to seek an interpretation of what I meant in one of

1 my orders that I will look at the language probably with a
2 clearer head than I have right now and attempt to reasonably
3 parse the words and, in doing so, make a judgment as to not
4 only what the language means but how it should be applied as a
5 legal matter.

6 MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 MR. LEMAY: Your Honor, very brief?

8 THE COURT: Mr. LeMay? This is sort of remarkable
9 because I thought that I had ruled and that I was going to
10 leave and that everybody was going to do some work. But here
11 you go.

12 MR. LEMAY: Your Honor --

13 THE COURT: And you were so good about saying that
14 you're going to be brief when you spoke earlier.

15 MR. LEMAY: And I'll be even briefer now, Your Honor.
16 David LeMay from Chadbourne & Parke. I had raised in my
17 argument the concept of an escrow of the purchase price. Mr.
18 Miller, I think, basically took issue with that. I didn't hear
19 Your Honor's ruling encompass that issue and I simply ask that
20 Your Honor --

21 THE COURT: It does not encompass that issue. You've
22 confirmed that I did not address that issue at all. So it
23 would have been probably even better had you said nothing.

24 MR. LEMAY: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: We're adjourned as far as this hearing is

1 concerned.

2 ALL: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 (Applause)

4 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 12:41 a.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

T E S T I M O N Y

WITNESS	EXAM BY	PAGE
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Qureshi	102
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Bienenstock	111
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Sabin	118
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Rosner	120
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Byrne	127
Herbert H. McDade	Mr. Miller	135
Barry W. Ridings	Mr. Qureshi	146
Barry W. Ridings	Mr. Miller	153

EXHIBITS

PARTY	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
Debtor		Copy of execution copy of asset	133	23
		purchase agreement among LBHI, LBI,		
		LB 745 LLC and Barclays Capital, Inc.		
		dated 9/16/08 and first amendment		
		thereto dated 9/19/08		

I N D E X, cont'd

R U L I N G S

DESCRIPTION	PAGE	LINE
Debtor's motion for an order confirming status of Citibank clearing advances approved	57	1
Sale transaction approved	245	25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Lisa Bar-Leib, certify that the foregoing transcript is a
true and accurate record of the proceedings.

LISA BAR-LEIB

Veritext LLC
200 Old Country Road
Suite 580
Mineola, NY 11501

Date: September 22, 2008